

Moses and Aaron
OR THE
MINISTERS RIGHT
AND THE
MAGISTRATES DUTY

Vindicated from the Exceptions
made against both, by *Richard King-*
noth, in a late Book of his, Entitled

The true Tything of the Gospel-Ministers.

By DANIEL POINTEL, a servant of Jesus
Christ, and Rector of the Church of Christ
at STAPLEHURST.

Prov. 18. 17. *He that is first in his own cause seemeth
just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him.*

Rom. 2. 22. *Thou that abhorrest Idols, dost thou com-
mit Sacriledge?*

Psal. 77. 20. *Thou leddest thy People like a flock by the
hand of Moses and Aaron.*

LONDON,

Printed by T. C. for Samuel Gellibrand, at the Gol-
den Ball in Pauls Church-yard: 1657.

MOSES AND AMARON
 OR THE
 MINISTER'S RIGHT
 AND THE
 MAGISTRATE'S DUTY

Vindicated from the Exceptions
 made against both, by Richard King-
 ward, in a late book of his, Entitled

The true Typing of the Gospel-Ministry.

BY DANIEL BOWNE, a servant of Jesus
 Christ, and of the Church of Christ.
 LONDON: J. STURGEON.

Prov. 1. 1. The Lord is the Lord of the
 world; but his weight and compass are
 Rom. 1. 2. The Lord is the Lord of the
 world; but his weight and compass are
 Psal. 1. 1. The Lord is the Lord of the
 world; but his weight and compass are

LONDON

Printed by J. C. for James Galsworthy, at the Gold-
 den Hall in Lamb Church-yard: 1825.

An Apologetick INTRODUCTION
to my dear Brethren the Church and
People of STAPLEHURST.

Have found this cause between me and my neighbour among the saddest things that have befallen me since God brought me to this place: And of many things deeply afflicting, this is not the least, that I am forced to a publick vindication for a publick offence, and therein know not how to clear my self without shaming an aged disciple, who is both the wrong-doer and the false accuser. It is not much agreeable to my spirit to print upon any thing (especially in this youth of mine) but to print upon this Subject hath been much more against my spirit than most things else; nor but that the matters are weighty, and greatly useful to the Churches welfare, and the debates of this present time, so it will be a word spoken in season; But many others are concerned in it; and who am I, that I should stand up as a Champion for the two great Pillars of the Land, Magistracy and Ministry, in a time of shaking, through so many fierce contradictions against them both? Besides, this Cause is fully pleaded already by sundry learned & judicious pens, never yet answered, nor ever likely to be answered; whereas (as to the matter of Tythes) though many indeed appear against the divine right, especially of our beyond-sea Divines, both Popish and Reformed; yet few or none of any judgment appear against the lawfulness of them. 3. Because all undertakings of this nature are likely to meet with misconstructions enough from those men that know not how nor to look aquint upon any thing we either say or do. That charity that thinketh no evil, how is it fled from the earth! it will be thought by many a sufficient answer to all that is brought on the Ministers behalf, to cry out covetousness; and to all on the Magistrates, to cry out persecution. 4. But then when an unwelcome cause must be managed after an unwelcome manner, the cause not to be handled in Theſis, but in Hypothesis, and that drawing in many personal things, and mixing affections with judgements; so that we have now to answer not Error only, but anger, peevishness, self-will, self-interests; and as flowing from them, calumnies, false accusings, unfaithful dealings, &c. Upon these thoughts I have been rolled up and down in my mind, sometimes for replying,

flying, sometimes against it, all very necessary hath compelled me.

At the first reading of this Book, I thought I might safely let it alone, and that it needed no answer; but when I understood how it was eyed up by that party, and now prized by himself, and that this persuasion was entered into others (not Anabaptists) that some things in it were not to be answered; and seeing how unlikely it was that any Books, new or old, would ever be looked after by them to remove this prejudice, unless some one were brought to their hands from a person known to them, and fitted to this Book and Cause, in which many things of fact are mixed with the matter of right, which no mans Book could answer but mine, and which I have understood have and do lie in the way of some (though I hope not of many) who have had a greater account of my Ministry, till this unhappy debate sprang up. These things have resolv'd my former doubtfulness, and produced this Treatise here presented unto you.

Dr. Tillesly's
whole Book
against Selden
is of this pur-
posely.

I hath added to my encouragement in this work, to see not much time needed in this question, to turn over the writings of Ancients, they to whom I write valuing them not; and that work being done to our hands already by many for their sakes who do value them; and our Learned Adversaries of the Divine Right of Tythes acknowledging what is pleaded upon that account, not onely out of the monuments of Heathens, they are said to have done it *assutia Diaboli*; more probable, I think, what we finde in the famous Law of Edward the Confessor, That the withholding of Tythes was *Infinum Diaboli*, then that the meer paying of Tythes was: Some also enquire why the 7th Of time among the Heathens should not be as much *assutia Diaboli*, as the tenth of goods. As for Fathers, they are after a cleanly ingenious manner put with *patres excusari possunt*, &c. So then Heathens & Fathers are confessedly out, we must try out the rest by Scripture only; for they that will not be pressed by us with the authority of Fathers, will not (I hope) press us with the Authority of later Popish Monks, the *Pontifical Schoolmen*, who are all in this cause (and good reason why) against us.

River in Gen.
19.

Clem. Alex.
Stro. 5. p. 600.
Εἰς τὴν ἑσπέραν
ἐκείνην ἡμέραν
ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη
ἐγένετο ὡς ἡ
Σόδομα καὶ ἡ
Γόμορρα. Σιμι-
λίαι δὲ αὐτῆς
685.

Had my neighbour spared injurious speeches, and not filled his Book with so many unkind calumniation, but kept himself close to the question of right, I should never have found fault with his omitting the narrative of matters of fact; But seeing he hath sprinkled his Book all over with so much of that unfavoury salt, I am forced to let you understand thus much, that covetousness is a sinne that hath deep roots; and is not plucked up many times when we think it is; and when it is stubbed up in the main root, it will yet leave many small fibres behind, which will often be a springing above ground, and require a constant hand, watchfully and industriously employed in plucking them up; and it would be more worth my neighbors time, now in his old age, among other things, to enquire curiously into his own heart about this sin; rather then spend his approaches to the grave in peevish quarrellings with, and revilings of his neighbour, who would fain have liv'd at peace with him. Did I take
any.

any joy in recriminations, it were no hard matter to evidence fore suspicions of covetousness in him, even in the matter in debate between us. I offer to take half the worth of what was (in my account) due to me, for peace sake; he offered about half of that which I would have taken; and no man but will say he might with as good conscience have offer'd enough as any thing; a greater proportion then a tenth freely given, would have prevented this suspicion, whereas a much less offer'd, and onely to break off the agreement upon the account of the sum to be paid, does not. I promised upon his intreaty to forbear him, if he came in any reasonable time to pay me, and I kept my word above three years together: He promised to compound with me by the pound rent, consenting to my termes offered, and broke his promise, adding contempt to boot, by laying me down twelvy shillings for three yeares, who had laid me down fourty shillings for one year, as he said, because he had promised me. I dealt with him fairly and openly, he dealt deceitfully with me; for after he had chosen to compound with me by the yearly rent, liking that better, as he said, then to compound by the Acre, for then he might use his Land as he pleased, he offer'd to bring me his Lease, that I might see what rent he paid; whereas it is known there are some pounds reserved of his Rent which are not specified in his Lease: I am perswaded this was never done by his Landlord; my truly honored friend to abuse the Minister. The goods controverted I am ready to make good my claim to, by that which determines all mens claims among men to things of this nature; the just and righteous Laws of the Land; he avoids that tryal, even with contempt, and rebellion after contempt, to the lawful commands of the Supreme Magistrate, as not having any title at all to them that is pleadable in any Court of England; and if the Law of God makes them his, I desire to see that Law; such an evidence I hope will satisfie Magistrates and me too; If he detain them by mans Law, let him plead it; if by Gods Law, let him shew it; if by neither, it plainly appeares he hath no right at all, and I should pray him to detain them no longer; it is sin: I never doubted the lawfulness of receiving Tythes, he never denied the payment of them, or a composition for them, to buy his peace, till he had to do with me; whence I suppose he alwayes held it lawful so to do; neither hath he given us one reason in his Book why his mind is chang'd. Add that he saves his goods, by a deed of gift to his Sons, and ventures his person, though a person of that moment to soules, as an Elder preaching freely to a Congregation baptized many years. What truth there is in this pretence, let his own heart judge; what honesty there is to convey a mans estate, to defraud creditors, let others judge; but what piety it is for a n Elder of a Church, the freedom of whose person is of that precious value in the exercise of his Ministry, to secure his goods in a contest, and venture his person

person, when the debate was about the goods, not about the person, let the members of his own Congregation judge.

These are fore suspicions in him, of the sin I am so often charged with, even in this very business; yet I dare not with all this evidence name him so; I know these dealings may be referred to other causes; of which some are not so bad as covetousness, and some are worse: I only should advise him to consider his ways: Neither dare I wholly excuse myself from this sin, though I could say much to clear my self in the day of man, and I know this mans accusations are without proof: I hope, grace enabling me, to approve my heart to God, a greater witness than man. I say no more then this, he is aged; and I, though but in the thirty fourth year of my life, am weak, as being lately pulled back by a powerful hand of God, from the very Brink of an Heetick Fever, and still in a constant inclination thither again: we had need not accuse one another rashly; there is one will shortly accuse us both more vehemently then we can one another; and it will be our best wisdom to prepare both of us with all seriousness, how to answer his accusations.

Rev. 12. 10.

But how could this word drop from my neighbours pen, that *Englands Priests never yet learnt in every condition to be content? what not so much as one excepted, and never* I could tell you neighbour of one, the least of ten thousand, that professeth in the sight of God, that the greatest discontent he doth, and hath for a long time gone under, is his own, and yours, and other mens sins, and yet not of so vast an estate as may be an eye-foreseeing up the plague of envy in any man. Oh Neighbour, in the fear of God consider what Spirit it is puts you upon judging the hearts of so many alive and dead, known and unknown to you, many of them such as have been the glory of the Churches of Christ all the world over. I say not, the Lord rebuke you, but I say, the Lord give you repentance, and make you know that a friendly admonition about the breach of Gods Law is no threatening you; neither before in the eighth, nor now in the ninth Commandment. Let profane wicked ones, who will not get out of the danger of the Laws penalty, say they are threatened when they are told of a Law of God (the Law is not against them that are lead by the Spirit, direct them it does) but you are an old Disciple; other apprehensions become you, and a more willing conformity to the mind and will of God.

P. 21.

P. 18.

Gal. 5. 23.

I used no sharp words then, neither do I now; do not put forth your hand to take and keep your Neighbours goods against the lawful owners mind; it is against the eighth Commandment; do not bear false witness against the hearts of so many, multitudes of whom the world was not, is not worthy; it is against the ninth Commandment; God is the Judge, he will require it; think of it, I intreat you as a Father.

That

(69)
That expression of my resolution to recover my right from him, if
he and I lived together, as he proposes it, does favour at least of un-
advised passion, if not of revenge; but he professeth he did not pub-
lish it with that intent, and I accept of his profession, though his re-
peating it often, and especially his leaving out my own explication
of my self, that it was a resolution grounded upon conscience of my
duty, that I ought not to lose the Tide to so considerable a part
of the publick revenue given for the good of souls, of which I have
only the benefit during my present service in the place (which in
another place himself sets down) leave but small ground of credit to
this profession of his. Had he now set both together, I am most re-
solved to endeavour the recovery of my right, if you and I live to-
gether, and added what follows; I say I am most resolved I shall fin-
ish if I do not, &c. it would have took out all suspicion of revengeful-
ness out of the Readers mind concerning me; I being necessitated to
write so openly, he mis-interpreting my former soft and tender dea-
ling with him, to be only a train to draw him into danger, and that
there was a Snake under the leaf of my former smoother expressions;
the reasons of my chusing that form of expression was, because his age
and my weakness made it appear very likely, that one of us might be
taken out of this life before this debate should be ended, considering
his obstinacy and my duty: Which if it fall out either way, the ques-
tion of right would be taken up by others, and the question of the
present profit now due would fall to the ground, in case he died; if
the intended deed of gift be true (at least I then thought so) and
in case of my decease before him, I was resolved to leave it free to
those I should leave behind me, to do as God should direct them;
and this (now I am fallen upon that displeasing task) is one instance
of unfaithfulness that his book is guilty of; he should not by setting
down doubtful words without my explication have rendered me ob-
noxious to the censure of revengeful from those that do not know
me; Though he professing to me, it was done without any mali-
cious intent upon that account, I contradict not, but suppose it so as
he professes.

2. But then when he tells the world in his Preface, he hath adven-
tured to answer all my arguments that (to his remembrance) I ever
brought for Tithes, will need another confession from him, when he
never had any from me, purposely misst on, but that of lawful
Donation, yea I professedly waved all other pleas to him; it being
with me a general rule in this quarrelling age, that if I can persuade
men to practise their duty upon principles which no man contradicts,
I will never trouble them with those principles that are and; no one
thing of all he pretends to reply to for the right of Tithes, as mine
was mine indeed, except that of Donation. Here also I find him as
becomes a Christian Offender, acknowledging his wrong doing, that

P. 61.

87

that

that he answered other mens reasonings besides mine, and that he ought to have to the world as much: I add, And to have faithfully distinguished mine from other mens.

3. In the same Preface he tells us his is but a mite in regard of what others have done in this thing, as if the right of Tithes were such a forlorn cause, as had none to plead it, and multitudes had wrote largely against it, who when I question'd with him about it, could name but one, besides *Brownists* and *Quakers*, who rage more then they dispute.

P. 3.

4. I never explained the Law said to be changed, *Heb. 7. 12.* by the portion of Tithes, the Law or portion of Tithes, nay I professed the contrary, and it was the only answer, which upon conference I gave him when he used that Scripture.

5. I never said it was but the Priesthood, nothing but the Priesthood is changed; the Text tells us that besides, and with the Priesthood there is a Law changed, in my account the Law of Ceremonial Worship, not Tithes: The National Teacher said none of those things.

6. If the proportion be changed, be it so, words I never spake, nor never shall admit; for a change is the substitution of one thing for another removed; if then the proportion of Tenth be changed another is set up; a ninth, eleventh, &c. which none affirms.

P. 4.

P. 12.

7. If Ministers have nothing but what their Flock in their Parish will freely give them, they may starve; and for this he comes upon me with, *Sir*, you have said enough, and afterwards calls this a *strange* Carnal reasoning: But these words I never said, neither can he ever make them good. Oh *Sir*, you have said too much; false slanderous speeches of your Brother are more strange and Carnal then this reasoning is, though I had used it.

P. 5, 6.

P. 8.

8. *Jf. 49. 23.* brought as alledged by me, and a kind of an answer framed to it, which Scripture I used not to him, whereas *2 Chr. 31. 4, 5.* & *Neh. 13. 9.* which I indeed need have no answer at all given them.

9. I wonder not you laboured so much the choice of such *Partial* Men as have Personages of their own (as they call it) that helping themselves they might help you; untrue every word, I never laboured much in that business, I never heard any commend any Gentleman to the acceptance of the Countrey upon that account. I have inquired among my Brethren, and none of us knows one Gentleman that hath any Impropropriations; I have heard of some great Impropropriours cried up on the other side; I do freely profess that, had I known of such a thing of any of them, I should have known great worth in him to ballance that evil, or else I should never have given my voice for him.

I call it an evil and a great one, most needful to be reformed. *King James* calls the Act by which they were taken away a Vile Act; and

and yet neither he nor his Son take any offence at it, nor do they
Vile Act. I hope after all our needless quarrels, some at last will find
out the way of settling about that most necessary work, the laying in
of impositions. *100* *101* *102* *103* *104* *105* *106* *107* *108* *109* *110* *111* *112* *113* *114* *115* *116* *117* *118* *119* *120* *121* *122* *123* *124* *125* *126* *127* *128* *129* *130* *131* *132* *133* *134* *135* *136* *137* *138* *139* *140* *141* *142* *143* *144* *145* *146* *147* *148* *149* *150* *151* *152* *153* *154* *155* *156* *157* *158* *159* *160* *161* *162* *163* *164* *165* *166* *167* *168* *169* *170* *171* *172* *173* *174* *175* *176* *177* *178* *179* *180* *181* *182* *183* *184* *185* *186* *187* *188* *189* *190* *191* *192* *193* *194* *195* *196* *197* *198* *199* *200* *201* *202* *203* *204* *205* *206* *207* *208* *209* *210* *211* *212* *213* *214* *215* *216* *217* *218* *219* *220* *221* *222* *223* *224* *225* *226* *227* *228* *229* *230* *231* *232* *233* *234* *235* *236* *237* *238* *239* *240* *241* *242* *243* *244* *245* *246* *247* *248* *249* *250* *251* *252* *253* *254* *255* *256* *257* *258* *259* *260* *261* *262* *263* *264* *265* *266* *267* *268* *269* *270* *271* *272* *273* *274* *275* *276* *277* *278* *279* *280* *281* *282* *283* *284* *285* *286* *287* *288* *289* *290* *291* *292* *293* *294* *295* *296* *297* *298* *299* *300* *301* *302* *303* *304* *305* *306* *307* *308* *309* *310* *311* *312* *313* *314* *315* *316* *317* *318* *319* *320* *321* *322* *323* *324* *325* *326* *327* *328* *329* *330* *331* *332* *333* *334* *335* *336* *337* *338* *339* *340* *341* *342* *343* *344* *345* *346* *347* *348* *349* *350* *351* *352* *353* *354* *355* *356* *357* *358* *359* *360* *361* *362* *363* *364* *365* *366* *367* *368* *369* *370* *371* *372* *373* *374* *375* *376* *377* *378* *379* *380* *381* *382* *383* *384* *385* *386* *387* *388* *389* *390* *391* *392* *393* *394* *395* *396* *397* *398* *399* *400* *401* *402* *403* *404* *405* *406* *407* *408* *409* *410* *411* *412* *413* *414* *415* *416* *417* *418* *419* *420* *421* *422* *423* *424* *425* *426* *427* *428* *429* *430* *431* *432* *433* *434* *435* *436* *437* *438* *439* *440* *441* *442* *443* *444* *445* *446* *447* *448* *449* *450* *451* *452* *453* *454* *455* *456* *457* *458* *459* *460* *461* *462* *463* *464* *465* *466* *467* *468* *469* *470* *471* *472* *473* *474* *475* *476* *477* *478* *479* *480* *481* *482* *483* *484* *485* *486* *487* *488* *489* *490* *491* *492* *493* *494* *495* *496* *497* *498* *499* *500* *501* *502* *503* *504* *505* *506* *507* *508* *509* *510* *511* *512* *513* *514* *515* *516* *517* *518* *519* *520* *521* *522* *523* *524* *525* *526* *527* *528* *529* *530* *531* *532* *533* *534* *535* *536* *537* *538* *539* *540* *541* *542* *543* *544* *545* *546* *547* *548* *549* *550* *551* *552* *553* *554* *555* *556* *557* *558* *559* *560* *561* *562* *563* *564* *565* *566* *567* *568* *569* *570* *571* *572* *573* *574* *575* *576* *577* *578* *579* *580* *581* *582* *583* *584* *585* *586* *587* *588* *589* *590* *591* *592* *593* *594* *595* *596* *597* *598* *599* *600* *601* *602* *603* *604* *605* *606* *607* *608* *609* *610* *611* *612* *613* *614* *615* *616* *617* *618* *619* *620* *621* *622* *623* *624* *625* *626* *627* *628* *629* *630* *631* *632* *633* *634* *635* *636* *637* *638* *639* *640* *641* *642* *643* *644* *645* *646* *647* *648* *649* *650* *651* *652* *653* *654* *655* *656* *657* *658* *659* *660* *661* *662* *663* *664* *665* *666* *667* *668* *669* *670* *671* *672* *673* *674* *675* *676* *677* *678* *679* *680* *681* *682* *683* *684* *685* *686* *687* *688* *689* *690* *691* *692* *693* *694* *695* *696* *697* *698* *699* *700* *701* *702* *703* *704* *705* *706* *707* *708* *709* *710* *711* *712* *713* *714* *715* *716* *717* *718* *719* *720* *721* *722* *723* *724* *725* *726* *727* *728* *729* *730* *731* *732* *733* *734* *735* *736* *737* *738* *739* *740* *741* *742* *743* *744* *745* *746* *747* *748* *749* *750* *751* *752* *753* *754* *755* *756* *757* *758* *759* *760* *761* *762* *763* *764* *765* *766* *767* *768* *769* *770* *771* *772* *773* *774* *775* *776* *777* *778* *779* *780* *781* *782* *783* *784* *785* *786* *787* *788* *789* *790* *791* *792* *793* *794* *795* *796* *797* *798* *799* *800* *801* *802* *803* *804* *805* *806* *807* *808* *809* *810* *811* *812* *813* *814* *815* *816* *817* *818* *819* *820* *821* *822* *823* *824* *825* *826* *827* *828* *829* *830* *831* *832* *833* *834* *835* *836* *837* *838* *839* *840* *841* *842* *843* *844* *845* *846* *847* *848* *849* *850* *851* *852* *853* *854* *855* *856* *857* *858* *859* *860* *861* *862* *863* *864* *865* *866* *867* *868* *869* *870* *871* *872* *873* *874* *875* *876* *877* *878* *879* *880* *881* *882* *883* *884* *885* *886* *887* *888* *889* *890* *891* *892* *893* *894* *895* *896* *897* *898* *899* *900* *901* *902* *903* *904* *905* *906* *907* *908* *909* *910* *911* *912* *913* *914* *915* *916* *917* *918* *919* *920* *921* *922* *923* *924* *925* *926* *927* *928* *929* *930* *931* *932* *933* *934* *935* *936* *937* *938* *939* *940* *941* *942* *943* *944* *945* *946* *947* *948* *949* *950* *951* *952* *953* *954* *955* *956* *957* *958* *959* *960* *961* *962* *963* *964* *965* *966* *967* *968* *969* *970* *971* *972* *973* *974* *975* *976* *977* *978* *979* *980* *981* *982* *983* *984* *985* *986* *987* *988* *989* *990* *991* *992* *993* *994* *995* *996* *997* *998* *999* *1000*

11. Did you not undertake to prove the affirmative (that Mini-
sters maintenance ought to be under the Gospel, after the same man-
ner as under the Law, from 1 Cor. 9. 14.) No, I did not. I have more
then once given it him under my hand, that I did not; wherefore
then brought you the examples of Herodias & Nehemiah? not only my
Papers once and again, but his own reasonings shew him why: he had
affirmed it must be under the Gospel as it was under the Law, 1 Cor.
9. 14. but under the Law it was free. Abrahams payment to Melchisedec
was free; Jacobs vow was free, &c. so it ought to be under
the Gospel: to which plea of his I denied not his reasoning out of
1 Cor. 9. 14. but let him carry it there, only denying it to be free un-
der the Law; telling him it was unlikely Abraham and Jacob should
hit upon that proportion, without some signification of Gods pleasure
about it; for after-times the Law of God and man both are manifest
(and by the way, if Abrahams and Jacobs fact were free, yet the A-
postle in that place manifestly referring us in the similitude to the
times after Moses, yet after the building of the Temple, when there
were certain Laws, both of God and man, for the payment of Tithes,
my Neighbour reasoning he used, did most certainly cut the throat
of his own cause) and for the Laws of man, those two examples
were given.

12. When I asked you whether you did demand it by the Law of
God? you answered no. I did not say so: only I waved that ques-
tion, as being unwilling to trouble him with it.

13. He adds immediately is from me; you were no Jew nor Le-
vite, &c. This was not in answer to the question about the Law of
God in general, as he relates it falsely: but in answer to the question
of the Law of God, as it made Tithes due to the Levitical Priesthood,
(as such) for I was no Jew, &c. This he wrote out of the Narrative
of the Conference word for word, from whence he might have re-
lated the rest with faithfulness, for it was before him.

14. When I asked you, Do you require it by the gift of Indulgent
Princes? you say no. The quite contrary is most true; I always
pleaded it to him by the gift of Indulgent Princes and people, and
never used to him any Argument but that; and my similitude to
make things plain to him was this: A Teshaur dies, and leaves me
a Legacy; his Executor refusing to pay, is constrained so to by order
of Law; the Law here does not ground the Tide, but the Teshaur
will;

P. 9.
I have since
seen this see-
ingly said by
reverend Au-
thors of a late
very useful
treatise: but
it is an over-
sight to be win-
ked at.

will; it only confirms the will; and affords a remedy to the injured person. This he knoweth, and hath confessed: was my Language to him, for what he brings.

15. Yet to decide the simple, you plead both. I challenge him to name the person, to whom I have said otherwise in this; or in any other point. Then I have said nothing; and then it will appear whether this be a slander or no.

16. Your Predecessor takes 20*l*. per an. of you to let you have the living, and cometh once or twice a year for his money, and Preacheth a Sermon to comfort it over. (Untrue, and incredible both.) through the grace of God I am what I am; I hope they that know me, do not believe that I need his out-money to purchase a living; I was sought to from London at that very time, from a people there after a free and full Election, as I have to know under their hands; this in the midst of my relations and acquaintance; and was likely I should wound my Conscience so deep without cause, that I might place my self in the dirt, far from my Friends; among a company of once strangers, or if I were so vain as well as wicked, could not this money matter be carried closely, as such manner of purchases are wont to be; were we all so many of us such for; we to proclaim our wickedness in the face of the Sun? No; no; there was no such matter; if ever I saw God's hand in any particular providence all my life, it was in his overruling hand, disposing me for Staplehurst, and bringing me so it; it was God's work; I am most and outwardly abused on it, and none but Devils: had I not seen it most apparently, I had never said here; what was done between me and my Predecessor, was done before many witnesses; it was but this: Two Ministers consenting to Preach to the same people, by consent likewise share the proportion both of time and maintenance which each should have, that there might be no difference about these things afterwards, nothing more only laudful to be done, but in a manner necessary; on my part with all sincerity undertaken and performed; God is witness; as for my truly honoured Predecessor, his integrity needs not my defence; he is able to do it himself in a season and manner convenient, if need be.

17. More might be said from experience in this Parish, but I spare a most merciful Reviler: we are guilty in things it seems not to be named, such is the modesty and tender-heartedness of the man; For my part, where I walk out of the way of my duty, I desire not to be spared, let him or any man reprove me in a way of Gospel Charity: he that spares my sins, does not spare me, is cruel to me; I desire for ever so to think: But if the concealed matters be of the same nature as this which is expressed (and one would think impudent lies should not be uttered, and things true hid) oh that he would at last learn to spare his own soul, use no more false and uncharitable approaches, and repent of these; even the Saint, God is a consuming fire.

19. They peculiarly prepare war, *Mic. 3. 5.* there is no principally in the Text either in word or sense; but its put in that I suffer above three years patience may be the more deeply wounded by a false accusation; how often have I been thoked by this man, and commended for my long forbearance.

P. 19.

20. Like the Priests Boyes, *1 Sam. 2. 14. 15. 17.* had my Neighbour pleased, I might have had that name of from upon me without changing the translation he uses into a worse, from a vibration Sermon, the *Levites* that Ministered unto the Priests in holy things did begin their service from 30 years age; I have attained through Gods patience some years above that, and yet can well enough bear that Title without any injurious reflection upon the infirmities of old age: Alas how childish are such Complaints as these in Brins, and how unbecoming the honour of Religion!

Num. 4. 3.

20. I adde one more drawn from the very cause (all these are personal) a thing more then once we are told of, and it tends to weaken the force of our civil constitutions in the behalf of Tithes. That those Princes Laws that first established Tithes in England did also establish the Catholick Faith of the Church of Rome, and all Traitors that denied it; whether this be a truth or no, I am sure he knows it not to be a truth; for being desired where these Laws might be found; now he tells me of *Henry the eighth*, no great Establisher of Tithes, I think, to be sure not the first; by and by he tells me of *Magna Charta*, wherein Tithes are not at all mentioned (but included in general among the rights of the Church) And whether ever there were any Law that makes it treason, nor to be of the Religion of Rome, let the skilful in the Law judge: hereby likely, but treason not likely. These uncharitable Censures, and plain Falschoods, I have privately demanded satisfaction for, and offer'd a fair debate of them before indifferent men (matters of Fact, coming most of them within the compass of an ocular demonstration, may admit of a speedy decision; if men will but see what is before their eyes) and this I did that I might prevent this ungrateful narrative, had it been accepted: and now I am still ready by the same means, to make good the narrative I have given to prevent unnecessary replies to this part of the discourse.

P. 7.

Though without in pudence to amazement he bring it in with, Be it known to you.

More of this nature hereafter.

I might adde a Sponge full of Vinegar, to wipe out the bitter taunts and un-Christian mockings the Book is full of, I cannot omit one; a sad passage where he makes himself sport with the oath of supremacy, and our praying for the King as such, and of Gods not hearing our prayers for providence hath disposed otherwise: the calumny of Princes (which hath been in our times to the amazement and astonishment of the whole world, so great that I should suspect my heart much harder then I hope it is, if I did not think of with horror and trembling every time it comes into my mind) this man

P. 10.

1 Pet. 2. 13.

thinks fit to shew at. But these things are beside the cause I man-
 age; the Lord cover them, and I shall gladly draw my skirt over
 them, having no engagement to speak to them but only to shame
 him openly; and that is not my design: it would be more joyfull
 to me, wherein we do amiss, either of us, to endeavour mutually by
 all offices of mutual love, to bring each other to repentance of 101
 all. For you, my dear Brethren of ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~city~~ ^{city}, my glory and crown,
 whose conversion and building up in the Truth is of greater sweet-
 ness to me when all the Tithes, either of poor or rich, however I am
 embraced: (no shame almost could have been so unhappily hit up-
 on as this) if ever I felt any sweetness and true joy in any thing all
 my life; it hath been in Gods crowning my labours with some suc-
 cess even among you, and in the assured hope of abundance more;
 his grace working with me; For you, I say, I have this word of cau-
 tion; Let not the esteem of this injurious both speaker and doer, be
 vile in your eyes; much more let not the name of godliness, which
 he hath for so many years held out a profession of, be for his sake de-
 spised: Remember how easie it is, for rash and heady persons, to
 commit many things which are sorely to be repented of; and how
 hard a thing it is for even good men (in whom pride is not thoroughly
 mortified) to be willing to shame themselves, by an open confession
 of open miscarriages; that you remember what easie passage there
 is from the head to the heart, and with what care we are to keep
 the Devil out of our heads, as we would keep him out of our hearts,
 and hands, and pens; That you beware of the beginnings of con-
 tention; strife hath no end, no measure, no moderation; it cares
 not how it hits, so by hitting it wounds: Set up an Angel of hea-
 ven for an adversary, and after we have chafed about him a while,
 he will be a Devil in our eye, fancy blinding our judgement, and
 self-conceit perverting straight resolutions, that whoever is not in all
 things on our side, is not thought to be on Gods side; and what
 evil may be in causes and persons, we strongly conceit is; so as no
 evidence of things seen and felt can bear us out of it, because we
 are mightily perswaded things cannot be otherwise then we have
 conceived them. So our brethren are clothed in Bear-skins, and
 then worried by us; and as they do in the hunting of noisome beasts,
 that's best play which most certainly and speedily dispatches; and
 this is plain dealing without flattery; and whatever is short of the
 utmost of our power, either in word or action, belongs to our pati-
 ence and mercifulness towards our and Gods enemies.

But learn we so overcome their evil with our good; if for our
 love men will be our adversaries, be we prayers; when they mock us,
 let not us mock them; when they despise us despise we not them; and
 let it not be said that we give them one reproachful word, who give
 us many; so shall we inherit the blessing we are called to. For the
 rest,

rest, Hold fast the form of sound words, and build up your selves and your families in the most holy faith. Suffer not ignorance or Apathy to dwell either in your hearts or houses. Labour to feel truth as well as know it, especially that which concerns the preciousness of Christ to a penitent believer. Get your Lamps lighted, and let them shine out. Suffer not the Gospel to be dishonoured by so much as one unfavoury word from you. Be jealous over those reasonings which take you off from Christian-fellowship; to doe soul-good to, and receive soul-good from one another, makes any society Christian; all the rest is Heathen; it is a precious Article of our Faith, The Communion of Saints. Get those evidences of Faith which are the parting duties where the unbeliever walks not with the believer, heavenly-mindedness, self-denial, and (those hard duties) the mortifying of revenge even in its lowest degree, and the love of enemies: doe you more then others for God, as you hope God shall do more for you then others. Be clothed with humility towards one another, and towards all men: God hath even in these our dayes had terrible controversies with proud self-conceited ones. And the very God of peace sanctifie you throughout, through patience and comfort of the Scripture give you hope; make you a leading example of piety to your neighbour-people, and a real consolation of them who say Gods Spirit hath left our Assemblies: That I may have comfort in you at that day, and you in me, that I may not have run in vaine, nor laboured in vaine. The prayers, I doubt not, of many of you, have preserved me a long time under deep languishings, and have now, in a great measure, recovered me out of them. As you expect and hope for any good by my Life and Ministry, be instant in prayer, and watch thereunto with all perseverance, that utterance may be given to me, that I may speak as I ought to speak; that God would give me the bow of Jonathan, that turned not back, and the sword of Saul, that returned not empty: And that when I have preached to others, I my self may not be a Castaway.

Pet. 3. 9.
Tim. 1. 13.

THE

The Ministers first Plea for his Portion,

The Divine Right of TYTBES.

To my Neighbour truly loved in the Lord,

RICHARD KINGSNOTH.



Mining many things Doctrinal overly reached in your Book, which are nothing to our present Cause, I find some things which are something and much to the cause, are not so much as touched as by you; give me leave to put you in mind of considering them. I find two very material questions wholly neglected.

P. 22. P. 7.

1. Whether supposing Tythes not due by Gods Law, but prohibited rather; and that our Lawes for them are not only old, but corrupt, like to the Law the Jewes had Christ should die (by the way a foul mistake this, they had no such Law, but wickedly pretended it; what? the Jewes Law was of Gods making, and did God make a Law requiring men to put Christ to death?) Yet is not a sinful Law of the Magistrate to be suffered under? and if we must suffer in one, may not, ought not a man to chuse rather to suffer in his goods then in his person, and expose them to buy his own peace, as a man delivers his purse to a thief upon the way to save his life? (an honourable similitude your friends are wont to use to set forth the authority of those good Lawes, under whose protection, next to Gods, you live) Why, neighbour, upon this ground you have acted hitherto, in paying, and preaching, as I am informed, for the payment of them; and is it not strange you should run over this foundation of your former practice, not so much as speaking one word of it? My neighbour, stay a while, and berthink your selfe; what hath carried you off from your former peaceable principle, resolution, and practice? Have you considered the Apostles rule, *That nothing be done through strife and vain-glory*? Let me put some thoughts into your mind. It is not to be imagined that *Jeroboam* and his Successors were so unpolitick as to take away the Levites Tythes: Priests he must have, and they must have a maintenance; why

why not that which was Gods own; and which the people had been long accustomed to pay? He had no reason unnecessarily to make provoking changes in matters of Religion; and there is no mention of his or their doing any such thing. Doubtless this habit to tempt the Lords Priests to stay and countenance the Schism and Idolatry would never be neglected. Now did any Prophet forbid this payment, or any of the Lords people scruple it? In the Family of David, instance in the long Apostacy under Manasses and Amon, what wicked Kings and Priests were then? yet none of Gods people were restrained from paying their Tythes. In Christs time, when the High Priesthood was, and for a long time had been bought and sold, that would give most undermining his fellow, many of them heretical Sadduces besides; yet is any relaxation of this duty even then? nay, are they not bound to it by Christs own bonds, *Mat. 23. 23*. In the Apostles times not one word so forbid any the payment of Tythes to the Christ-forfaking, and Christ-forfaken, blaspheming, persecuting Jewish Priests and Levites. Tythes were paid under Heathens to the Priests of Idol-Temples by the then Lawes, no one Apostle, Father, Martyr, ever contradicting; and yet they were zealous against compliance with Idols too. He that shall but read *Tertull. de Idolol.* will find strictness enough, if not too much, that way. If *Demetrius* stood up so fiercely for his caste, nor directly opposed by the Apostles, would not the Idol-Priests have stood up much more for their Tythes, if the Apostle had raised question about this thing among them? Nay *Peters* very ordinance will exact obedience active to all lawful commands; passive to all painful ones; and this among the rest, when the World was turned *Arian*, *Arianism*, *Nicene*, *Basil*, &c. never taught that Tythes were unlawful to be paid unto Teachers of *Arianism*; and at this day it is the constant resolution of all Protestant Divines to the quieting of schismatical confidences that have asked advice from them often and often. That those Princes Lawes which command Tythes to be paid to Popish Massing Priests, are to be submitted to by those of the Reformed Religion that live within the Dominions of such Princes. The like is the resolution of all Popish Divines concerning their Catholics that live under the Dominion of Protestant Princes, as appears by their general uncontradicted practice: But we must be used so as no Ministers of holy things were ever used, how bad so ever, who enjoyed the countenance of publick Authority; nay not so well as a thief that takes a purse. I put this case. Tythes are no private mans propriety (I speak of those paid to Ministers) let the user of land divide his own from what is not his own, and carry in what is his, leaving what is not his upon the ground, and then permit him this can bear it out in the Court of men (whether he

They paid the third years Tithes, Act. 4. 5. why not this too?

Acts 19. 17.
1 Pet. 2. 13.

Rivers differs in Gen. 14.

have a just right or no, whether those Lawes are righteous or no) to enter upon the land and carry it away. I ask now what Law of God this Farmer sins against, and whether he doe not his most apparent duty? if the Takers side be not good, the Leaver hath none at all, and cannot remedy the badness of the Takers (till he is not made a Judge to punish an Idolatrous Priest, much lesse is he to mulct the Priest, and take the fine to himself. Pray think of this question you have overlooked, you make too much haste: Have you stood thus long upon this ground, and doe you now relinquish it, without being beaten off with the assault of so much as one slight Argument?

P. 21.

2. Neither doe I finde any thing concerning the unlawfulness of a Tenth, supposing it freely paid and without compulsion. I meet indeed with Christs nailing ceremonies to his Crosse, and Tythe reckoned among the rest, but you seem not to mean that Tythes are a ceremony as Tythes, but as a forced maintenance. Frequently you tell us of Tythe chang'd into a free gift, a tenth into any proportion determined by the mind of the giver. In one place indeed we have the proportion chang'd, but then it is from *Levis to Malchisedechs* and *Jacobs*, from a tenth commanded to a tenth freely given and vowed at least; if theirs be the example, surely the tenth is not alone excluded. But my good friend, why this confusion? you found the questions distinguished to your hands, if Tythes be Ceremonies as Tythes, tell us plainly; if as stunted summes, and this is

P. 15.

that which is abolished as sure as Christ is come in the flesh, tell us so plainly too, that we may deal with you upon certainties. I see the main weight of your Book is against a maintenance stunted by the Magistrates Authority; and I took notice of it among the *Brownists* at the Conference at *Hedcote*; and this is not done without great and deep advice: They knew, that to satisfy some mens clamours, and other mens scruples, consultations had been enter'd upon, to alter the present way into some other supposed more commodious and free from contradictions: If therefore they would fasten any thing to the Ministers disadvantage, they must let goe the debate of Tythes as such, and take better hold; the Magistrate hath no power to injoyne any proportion at all; that will doe it; this Principle fits their turn, it strikes home. Agreeable to this was the killing Argument in the Remonstrance (or Petition) drawn up by them, and intended to be presented either to the Protector or Parliament, had they sped in their choice: If they build again what they have destroyed, they shall be found transgressors. They had been, and were a destroying our Ministry as Popish and Antichristian (alas that we should be such eye-sores to them for refusing our people, not only from Popery, but even from Hell!) and they would not build us up by paying any thing to our reliefe (I was

P. 18.

promised

granted the right of this Declaration when this was told me by an Agent in it; but upon second thoughts it was denied. No, let them, tax them; exact first fruits and tithes from them in utmost rigour, eat them up, consume them, beggar them, make them weary of their work by defrauding them of that bread which should feed their families, and defray their extraordinary charges. But what think you will become of this publick maintenance? who shall buy it the State, or the Landlord, or the Tenant? I have been answered to this question with they care not what they did with it, so we have none of it: well, and what when all's done? why, there is hope that some will joyn with *Spill-bills* Congregation; others with this party, others with another; every one will pull away something, when we are once removed out of the way.

Think of this ye Rulers, and let this Pamphlet, and others of the like stamp, teach you what services you must doe for these men before you can please them: 'Tis not Tithes they stick at; if that would have serv'd their turn, I had been free from molestation this day. There is no man payes me the reath of his increase, and much short of that would have contented me from this man. This you must doe, you must make Lawes against us, but none for us; that's the so much pressed example of the Primitive Magistrates; you must be Heathens both wayes, or they are not contented; you must take that from us, yea from God (*Concessum Deo*) which you never gave us; and of which you are but Feoffees in trust for Gods ends, and the fonder of man, who would not have one of your children left by you Orphans to be serv'd so; and when you have taken this away, you must give us nothing by way of recompence, nor so much as stick up a feather for the goose, as the proverb is. Strip us stark naked; and turn us out of all, that you may be the abhorring of God and good men for so doing, and then these giddy Masters will be pleased with you; you may guess how long till they shall think fit to levell other mens proprietie as well as ours, and pull down Magistracy, after Magistrates have, to please them, pulled down their own greatest supporting Pillar, the Ministry. As for me, (though I fear not so great a perfidiousnesse from our present Rulers, yet who knows what devilish Tyrants God may raise up in his wrath?) Then I doubt not but the Lord will stand by me, and strengthen me, and that he will beat down great mountains before me, I shall see Error, Division and sin, fall down before Truth, Unity, and Holinesse: Me thinks I see them tumbling down in *Staplehurst* alread; and in this confidence, if the Lord hath use of my Vast Estate, for his service, and the good of soules, I hope he will give me grace to lay it down at his feet, who gave it all to me, what ever it is: And I know multitudes of my brethren will subscribe this resolution with me, even all that are faithful. This one thing I adde, that

2 Cor. 10. 4.

the Apostle never took this carnal way to overthrow either Pagan, or Jewish blaspheming Priests, by storming at their maintenance; and I am assured it will never thrive with them that doe towards us, who are neither Jewish nor Pagan, I hope not in their account neither.

Those questions which are to the purpose, that have something said to them, are some of them lightly passed over; yet what is said to them, I shall not neglect to answer.

1. Concernes requiring maintenance from one that is not of our Parish-Congregation, but is separated from it, and doth not at all partake of our Ministry. It seems, Sirs, a toleration of you in your sinful separation will not serve your turn without special immunities above other men: Let men but take up a dissenting opinion, and proclame it to the credit of their singularity, telling the world they can hold no union with the contrary-minded, and presently all their Land must be Tithe-free: Would it not be a desirable thing for Landlords Rents, and all other debts to be paid thus? Oh how sweet would it be to drink away a Sabbath in a chimney-corner then! But to the Reasons. 1 Cor. 9. 7. *The Planter must drink of his own Vineyard, and the Feeder eat of his own Flock.* *Ans.* Not

P. 3.

2 Cor. 8. 13, 14.

to trouble you with that brotherly assistance that Churches owe to one another in case of need; but this I say, that this debt of maintenance takes not its ground from mens actual subjection to the word, but from their duty so to doe: And the duty once stated, not attending on the word, is one sin; and not maintaining the Dispensers of the Word, is another sin: Never did God provide that men should spare their purse, by being prodigal of their soules.

2. Suppose your Separation just, then indeed there will be no command of God to maintain that Ministry you are duly separated from, out of your own goods; yet there will lie a command of Gods to make another Separation, a Separation of that which is not your own from that which is; and to carry no more into your barn then your own goods, and leave the rest behind you. This (I hope) will satisfie you as to your first Reason.

P. 20.

To the Second. Where it is demanded that I prove a command, or one tittle of a command, to any Gentile, to pay Tithes to such as were not related to them in covenant.

Ans. No need of any such command to be produced. A baptized Christian under the Gospel, and an uncircumcised Gentile under the Law, hold no proportion to them; first you, then yours, is a good order. But for you, you have been related to the body of this people, at least in an implicite covenant, when you joynd with others in calling that faithful, holy, humble Minister of Christ, Mr. Biggs, to *Staplehurst*, and subscribing toward his maintenance, which, among other papers, I have had the perusal of, I have seen;

and

and how you walked with this people in way of seeking and enjoying God, in publick, and in private; your self and others can well remember: Separation imports a former union; you cannot therefore be in the same case as the *Philistines* and *Canaanites*, &c. who would it well among the people.

2. Yet because you promise this, that upon the discovery of such a command you will submit, I shall offer you something towards the proof of it. I hope you take the whole Land to be a type, both that which was subdued; and that which was unsubdued; and that Tythes were a ceremonial tribute from a ceremonial Land; and that Tythes were a ceremonial tribute from a ceremonial Land; would you not reason your self thus? You know that no League was to be made with the Inhabitants of the Land; and that the Law for Tithing ran universally of the whole Land before they had inherited it, not this part shall pay, another not: all was to be subdued, and all was to pay. Now put those two Laws together, *Then shall utterly destroy them, and thou shalt duly Tith all thy increase*, and then see whether this conclusion follow not, That the Tythe of the whole Land was due to God by Gods own Laws the commandment supposing none should live there but Brethren, Jews, or Proselytes; it is therefore of their Brethren, *Heb. 7. 1.* For the execution of this Law, there is no reason to expect that, neither is this demanded of me. Neither one Law nor the other was kept, and the Jews were not always in a condition to keep their oaths from the hands of strangers: Yet it may be considered, whether the Judges, when strong, would serve the Common-wealth of them, and not the Tabernacle; and that King *Sidon* should make a Levite of their persons for the service of the Temple; and not of their goods. There was doubtless as full a right for this, as that. But will you indeed submit upon this Discovery? Admit it done, would you not say, Though they were then bound, they and the Jews too, yet now we are freed from that yoke of bondage; you would never do as you have said; your whole Book drives at something else. Again, let me admit that not proved which you call for; what conclusion will you draw hence to help your Cause? It must be no more than this. Let a professed Pagan come and dwell at *Staplehurst*, who is, and always was an *Idolater*, I may not demand Tithes of that man. Is this it you call for so eagerly, as if the deciding of the whole controversy were turned here? And promise so presumptuously that this done, you would submit? Fie for shame of such heedless extravagant speeches; plainly, the clearing of that question neither helps nor hinders; yet if it will do you any good, I think you have something towards it however.

There is another question, which is more slightly touched by the former, the suing and imprisoning them that refuse to pay. I will not say you anywhere presumptuously deny it to be lawful in any case

P. 20. P. 7.

P. 16.

case to use the Magistrates sword; for the recovery of our own from them that unjustly detain it from us; and by no other means will be brought to doe their duty, though they be able; which is my very case with you. Yet you have some suspicious words that way, as when you call my using the Authority of Magistrates a Force; and that word is suing for Tithes peaceable, sounds that way too much: Yet I rather think (though you call me to minde this before you write them, and expresse your mind after them, as if you had thoroughly considered the businesse; and at last resolv'd I think not) that you did not indeed minde what you wrote your selfe: I am forced to conclude upon one; and I had rather conclude against your wisdom, then against your honestie; I hope you are not guilty of so wicked a doctrine: Unpeaceable to use the Magistrates help when there is no remedy? If this be your minde indeed, tell me, you that so bravely conclude it. This is the period of all, the Gospel must be free, and kept free from mans power; for *this is the ordinance of God.* Just so a Paul or an Angel, were the thing spoken of necessary to salvation, when this is not so much as true. It seems then, in matters of the Gospel, Magistrates (I suppose they are the men you mean, though Ministers also are men, and (I hope) have some power in the Gospel) may not meddle, by your leave: If then they may not meddle in money-matters, to determine of them, but he that uses them is an unpeaceable man; pray then what are they for? If you say this is no just debt, or that though Magistrates may determine of other money-matters, but not of this, they are the things mainly in question, and come now distinctly to be considered.

There is a three-fold plea for the Right of Tythes. The first is *Divine*, the second is *Law*, the third is *Humane*. The first is *Free-gift*. I have always concerned myself with the third, though protesting always that I denied not the two former; which peaceable way, seeing you interpret at any giving of them up, and bend the chief of your strength against those weapons were never brought out against you: I am forced to follow you, in defence of those reasons you choose to deal with; wherein I hope to make that appear to you which I then told you. That I was able to lay more to both these grounds of Right, then you know how to answer.

And first, I shall let you see with what Scripture evidence the divine Right of Tithes may be defended: In which I shall first lay down what tends to assert this Right, and then answer what you or others bring, so far as I know to the negative.

I shall not fetch the Rise of Tythes from Cains bad Dividend: let the Scholar debate that with learned *Montague*, if he please. I write not to the Learned, whom I am not fit to teach; nor against the

the Learned, whom I am not fit to grapple with. We will take it where we finde it, without turning over any Translation but our own. That is, Gen. 14. 20. And he (Abraham Heb. 7. 18) gave him Tithes of all.

We must here proceed distinctly, and step by step. And the P. 2. first enquiry is, Whether this were a free-will offering in Abraham, or an act of obedience to Gods Statute-law? a free-will offering, P. 15. Neighbour, you think it, and upon this pin the main body of your frame hangs; the change pretended being from *Aaron's* proportion to *Melchizedechs*: Now you know, from a tenth to a tenth, is no change in the maintenance; and if *Melchizedechs* were due by a Statute-law as well as *Levi*, I hope we are agreed, and your Book is answered.

Lets see now what you bring to prove this grand fundamentall affirmation; what is it? nothing; tis strange, but most true; verily nothing, unlesse you intend the word gave in the Scripture recited for a proof; though I cannot think your sovery ignorant of Scripture-language; it is a word that indifferently signifies either a free-gift, or a payment: had you consulted with me before you printed (as you might easily have done, we dwell but two fields asunder) I should have advised you to strengthen this main foundation-pillar of your discourse a little better. Lev. 7. 36. Deut. 26. 13.

But see now whether we can say any thing for the Law, that hath more conviction then your just nothing, or indeed as nothing for the free-will offering. First, I shall begin with the latter, which is laid down in Gen.

Can any reasonable man think that Abraham, a man for wholly moved by the direction of God, as appears in the story of his life, should now on the sudden determine in so singularly rare a passage without advice from God? To make out that something is due to *Melchizedech* as a Priest, would need no new consulting with God; we have that impression within us already. That something, must be a proportion out of every thing, perhaps no need we consult with God anew about that neither; tis to sanctifie the whole lump. But why this something should be a tenth proportion I will then say other, will need a new consulting with God about, unless you will suppose Gods mind known about it already, either by nature, or by tradition (either of which wayes points the cause for us) otherwise that this needful consulting with God was not made; but that Abraham did it by his own private motion (God & he not being such strangers) is very dishonourable to the Patriarch to affirm, and cannot but overthrow the Apostles reasoning from thence to Hebr. 7. such weighty truths; for what is to be made of this action if Abraham did it of his own head?

It cannot be therefore that this action was done by the instinct of

the Spirit of God; and that this instinct was a commanding instinct, and the command coming with that certain evidence to be of God, as would bind him as much as Scripture does us; writing giving not the Authority, but the evidence to the command. The conclusion then will be, *Abraham* had a command of God's not to be resisted, determining him, without any further enquiry, to the proportion of a Tenth in what he gave to *Melchisedech*; and if this be it which Christ hath chang'd the Law to *Melchisedech's* free-will offering, you will not gain much, nor we lose much in the cause between us.

But still, though this will prove the Law to *Abraham*, yet it will not prove the Debt to *Melchisedech*; he might be inspired to give an Alms; and this, though a Law to *Abraham*, would have been no debt of justice to *Melchisedech*; goe on therefore, and see what is to be found in the Story for this also. At first sight it seems improbable that the King of *Salem* should need an Alms; or if you will not call it so, but an Honorary given out of respect to his office, but not due in strict justice; yet why so great a proportion? the Tenth of all was a matter of no small value; yea, though we should finde no fault with our Translators rendering the Apostles *Angelicus* by spoiles. Such honorary observances we finde paid to Prophets, but never to Priests; and to Prophets in far smaller sums than this. Tenth of all was an high testimony of honour; and this no more then give and take, without so much as any such ceremony of respect as passed between two far meaner persons, *Esau* and *Jacob*. Sure though *Melchisedech* dealt like a King in his Bread and wine, yet he much forgot himself, if this were not a known communion due to his Priesthood from others as well as from *Abraham*; this indeed would shut out such passages of courtesie between them, and, I suppose, did.

Præsumptions from so short a story towards the demonstration of our conclusion, That Tithes were not given by *Abraham* to *Melchisedech's* Priesthood, but as a just due and right to *Melchisedech's* Priesthood. But goe we on to the Comment upon this Text to the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Ch. 7. See whether there is not enough to put the matter quite out of doubt, though a man should be never so morose and hard to be convinced.

V. 4. &c. we find giving of Tithes a demonstration of *Melchisedech's* greatness, and afterwards v. 9. a demonstration of *Levi's* Priesthood, being inferior to that of *Melchisedech's*: Now, though every payment of a debt be not a testimony of inferiority, yet no payment which is not of a debt, is so. A gift of courtesie would never have proved such a thing, but if any thing, the quite contrary.

V. 8. we meet with *Abraham's* offering to *Abraham*, he tithed *Abraham*, amidst rendered, he received Tithes of *Abraham*. *Beza's* Acci-

1 Sam. 9. 7, 8.

1 Kin. 14. 3.

Gen. 31. 8, 9, 10.

it so, think to too, as to that, of any other Religious use, not appointed by Christ himself: It were a strange thing to see fleshly sacrifices offered up religiously, & men to put the world off with they doe it to other uses and ends then for which it was done in the Law) it remains onely, that yielding the consequence of the supposition, we demand a proof of the so. But here we press them too far; it may be, and it is possible, must serve our turnes: And this is all we can have from those that plead onely against the Divine Right, and from them that plead against the lawfulness of Tithes too. Strange! A Law of Gods is produced between us, & confessed; only the perpetuity of that Law is denied; yet no evidence at all given to prove the temporary nature of it: He that sayes a known Law of Gods was in the nature of it temporary, had need not onely affirm it possible, but prove it certain. I take it to be evident they have nothing to say here, because where they have been often called upon to speak, and ought by such deep bonds of necessity, yet they say nothing. I adde, concerning those learned men that deny no more then the Divine Right, That if this payment to Melchisedech may be truly and properly a branch of the Ceremonial Law, it may be an unlawful payment also; and if it be certain it was so, it is certainly unlawful also: Another man may see the congruity of this answer to their own stating of the question; but truly I cannot.

So then we proclame a Law found out, they deny it not; we proclame again, we finde nothing in the Law why it should not be perpetual; they say not they doe, onely it is possible that they may; we proclame again; Attempt it, shew it, but they are silent.

Ye we will not leave them; we will try what we can say to the Negative (*ex abundanti*) that payment of Tithes to Melchisedech was not by the force of a Law ceremonial.

First, Melchisedech was a Priest of another Order, and not a Ceremonial Priest, else he should not be higher then Levi, nor for ever; nor should our Lord have been called a Priest after this Order, rather then after the Order of Aaron. And the service for which Melchisedech received Tithes, was not any work of Sacrifice, but for his work of Benediction, as it is manifest in the Text, and acknowledged by the famous *Capel*; though I know not what to make of his Parenthesis following (*quamquam nec ratio ista excludenda.*) It is an high presumption to say positively that Melchisedech offered any Sacrifice at all, when Scripture sayes nothing of it: To be sure, as he is brought in (and so he is a type of Christ, and so he took Tithes) he offered none. The Papists will never finde out a Sacrifice in the Bread and Wine, as busily as they hunt for it; a resemblance to our Eucharist the Fathers indeed have found out, but not a Sacrifice: And in this place we know Scripture silence is argumentatives Melchisedech

Gen. 14. 19, 20.
 in Theſibus
 Salmar.

being a Type, nor as he did, nor was a foreshadowing, but as he is supposed to have been, and to have done them, and to do his Tithing doth belong, and to nothing else. Add thereto we finde nothing Ceremonial in Melchisedechs Priesthood, to be verified a mystery by some other thing in Christ, nor in his name, King of righteousness, King of peace; nor in his Genealogie, without Father, and without Mother, nor in the end mentioned of his life and office; nor in the work of his Priestly office; all these were verified in Christ in the Letter; and 'tis wonderful that Tithing alone should be verified in Christ by a mystery, which mystrie I think, is not yet expounded by any, that we may know what it is; much less proved and made good.

If any shall say that the ceremonialness of Tithes, as paid to Melchisedech, consists not in their respective configuration, as paid to such a Priesthood, but in the absolute proper nature of them: This at the first sight is utterly improbable, that a Priesthood not Ceremonial, should be maintained by a maintenance essentially and in it self ceremonial: But let that pass; if a Ceremony be defined A carnal Rite in Religion appointed by God to shadow out Christ, or some spiritual grace in Christ, till it expire with the death of Christ; I think it will pose the wit of man to shew Tithes such a ceremony; for either this ceremony must be found out in the Tenth, or in the Law, determining any set proportion whatsoever.

If men say the Tenth as Tenth, is that which is essentially ceremonial, it should be shewn by what Scripture it is appointed by God to be, that the name Tenth abstracted from either Priesthood,

should be in it self designed to a ceremonial use, as being common to Levi with Melchisedech, to whom it could not have that use; and whatever is essentially Ceremonial, hath alwayes a Ceremonial use.

How a Tenth could be more carnal then a sixth, or a ninth, or a twentieth, which this Ceremony signifies.

What burden some else there is in a tenth to Christians more then in a ninth, or even then a twentieth, except that it is the bigger summe.

What other determinate proportion is shur up in its room, as it fared with other Ceremonies?

Say we then the tenth as a maintenance by Law determined is the Ceremony? Then I ask 1. What one title in Scripture to prove this?

2. How should this be more a ceremony then other tithes, by name of time for worship?

3. What answers this supposed Ceremony? not a free-will offering, taken to come in the room of a stinted summe; for that's not

Hebr. 7. 8.

the body which answered this shadow : *Spiritual sacrifices come in the room of fleshly ones*, but they are not the body of them ; no more can it be here, some other body must be found out for them, and what is that?

4. Why a Law for maintenance should not be Ceremonious, but a Law for this or that should.

Gal. 6. 6.

1 Tim. 5. 17.

1 Cor. 16. 2.

Luc. 12. 33.

5. Why Paul may determine it to something out of all mens goods that are taught in the word without a Ceremony, but may not limit the how much under danger of a Ceremony.

6. Why the double honour designed should not be a Ceremony, but the expresse determination of the how much should.

7. What Ceremony there is in the Apostles, *en eis' sunagorais*, what ever he hath charged ; and whether that were not a determinate Law ; why sell what you have. A determinate command, be not equally a Ceremony as what we speak of : Why more Ceremonious to say give a ninth with eleventh, &c. then sell all, and as it seems give all ; for they might as well keep it in land, as put it out to use or trade with it. He that can give a plain Scripture answer to such questions as these, that does not speak meer dreams of a man half asleep, and half awake, will exceed my understanding, and I dare say my Neighbours either, though with him this is the Ceremony, the Law, not the tenth.

It remains then a moral Law it must be, by force of which this payment was made to Melchizedek : yet not so moral as that a tenth rather than a ninth or eleventh should be sufficiently gathered from principles of nature left to it self ; numerical reasons are pretty things for a solitary phancy to delight it self with ; but the fineness of these inventions will never engage conscience to praise, especially when the purses of men are concerned ; yet this I will say for them, they are as good as those that are brought for the seventh of our time : in both which, the assigning, what proportion of our time and goods would please God, the reason of man being utterly defective, and needing help from a new Superior discovery, God hath helped us in both by a positive Law, guiding the blindness of reason, where it did not see its way ; in matter of time indeed most expressely, not so in matter of goods, yet sufficiently enough, as hath been proved against the Defenders of the free will offering, and is supposed by those we contend with now : yet if the tenth goods be in this respect disadvantaged above the seventh time, in that it hath not so expresse a positive institution, it hath the disadvantage abundantly made up, in that there is much seemingly against the morality of the Sabbath in the New Testament, whereas there is nothing against the morality of a tenth with any colour of sound reason produced, or to be produced, as I doubt not but when I come to those times, with Gods help I shall be able to demonstrate.

But

But no such positive Law to be found in the *New Testament*: 24. 20. Differt. in Gen. most excellent *Moses*, neither is there any such to be found there for the seventh of time, it is enough that we find both in the *Old Testament*, and that by Law never yet repealed: and so great a Divine should not say, that the Gospel hath antiquated all the *Old Testament* constitutions at one blow, and left them alone which are reestablished by a *New Testament* confirmation; no sound proof, or such a saying, and Christ's own most serious protestation is against it; yet whether such a positive may not be concluded from the *New Testament* also, shall be inquired into anon, so I dismiss for the present *Meletem*, &c. Math. 5. 17. detaching.

The second time we meet with Tithes in the Vow of *Jacob*, and this also is made a free will-offering by you my Neighbour, whom I now return to again, but without all show of reason, there being no appearance of any thing arbitrary in this thing; the Vow being as well of having the Lord for his God, as of giving the tenth; and *Jacob* being trained up in the steps of his Father and Grand-fathers, who had learnt without doubt that proportion to be acceptable to God; it is not to be thought *Jacob's* tithe was more free than *Abraham's*; for why should the Grand-child be less under a Law than the Grand-father was? Nay if your reasoning be good, though it had been free to *Abraham*, it must be a Law to *Jacob*; unless *Jacob* due be supposed to bind his posterity for so many Generations, yea to this day if Christ had not changed it; whereas *Abraham's* payment binds not so much as his Grand-child; *Jacob's* Vow was altogether almost personal as *Abraham's* Fact.

Then if the Law stand good in *Jacob's* time; the question next will be what Law it was, of which there being nothing determined about the persons that received them, nor about the uses they were put to, in this or in any other Scripture, I only conclude thus much, that there is no evidence of any thing ceremonial and temporary in this Example of his, but that in the same channel, in which we found Tithes running at first they run still, any thing from this instance before us to be drawn notwithstanding.

Go on now to *Moses* time; where the statute Law is acknowledged: and from whence the greatest conjectures against the morality of Tithes are drawn; yet should we grant them as much as from their respect to the Levitical Priesthood may be concluded an intercurrent transient ceremonial use; yet this would no way overthrow their first right originally, and (for what yet appears to the contrary) perpetually due to God, and by him conferred upon another Priesthood.

Tithes have not their original from the Levitical Priesthood, for they ran a long course before; neither have they their expiration with the Levitical Priesthood, for they have run a longer course

Since : while they and the Levitical Priesthood were in Society, we respect they had no that Priesthood ; but now the same they are as they were before, without any respect to God and his sacrifices at all. This would make short work of the cause, & would not be disproved, but either by showing them not to have had any other Fountain but the Levitical Priesthood ; which is manifestly false and disproved all-ready ; they had a course long before, even by Law : or that Jordan like, they are swallowed up in the dead Sea of the Levitical Priesthood, and ought not at least to have appeared above ground ever after ; which answer hath in part been overthrowed already, when it was shown that Tithes are not essentially, and in themselves ceremonial ; and shall be more fully examined here after when it shall be made appear, that the Gospel hath made no alteration in this matter, nor changed the Law.

But that I may not be said to pass slightly over that where the main stresse of the adverse cause is supposed to be, I shall view more exactly the passages which are found in the Mosaic Law about this matter.

Those Laws of paying Tithes, were either such as bound the people, or such as bound the Levites. Those that did bind the Levites, were to be paid from them to the High Priest. These we inquire not after now ; we find them not before, and we find them not since, till the Pope had a mind to play the High Priest, and our Princes since to receive the money ; but we acknowledge no such Officer since Christs Reformation, therefore no such Tith due to any.

The Laws of Tithes from the people were of three sorts : One to Sacrifices and Feasts, which was Ceremonial : Another to the Poor, Stranger, and Levite, which was Judicial : A third to the Levites, which we suppose was Moral.

Num. 18. 21. The tithing for Sacrifices, and the tithing for the Levites were
Deut. 14. 23. two distinct tithings : One was for Levite maintenance, the other for
Num. 18. 31. the Lords Feasts, to be eaten by him that paid it. One was to be

paid to the Levite where he dwelt, there paid sure where eaten (I had almost said, that all the Antiquaries in the world should never persuade me to so unreasonable a thing, that from all parts of the inheritance of Gods people on this side, and on that side Jordan, the Husbandman must carry his tithe in kind unto Jerusalem, and that then I know not who should carry it back again to the Levites respective habitations ; the Levites Cities were in all likelihood the Store-houses for the Fields near them) the other was to be carried to Jerusalem : One was to be eaten in any place ; the other in the place which the Lord shall chuse : One might not be redeemed, nor the Tithe of the Hay, Corne &c. but by adding a fifth part, nor of the heard at all ; but the tith for the Feast might ; so these two were plainly two distinct tithings, and both paid by the people every year.

The

The third years tithing was distinct from them both; not all one with the tithing for the Feasts; for must the Feasts be neglected then, and the Law broken every third year? Is not the third years tith to be laid up within thy Gates, and eaten within thy Gates; whereas the tithes for Feasts were to be carried to Jerusalem; and eaten at Jerusalem? and why should the third year be called the year of tithing; if no more were done that year then at other times? plainly they are two distinct Laws; and must have a distinct obedience.

Deut. 16. 16,
17. & 14. 28,
29.
16. 12.

The Tithes for Feasts, were Ceremonial, and were never before, nor ever after; only from the equity upon which they were grounded, will one Argument among others be brought for our offerings, towards the furnishing of the Lords Table, though a far less proportion will serve for that use; so on all hands no ground of this Tithes continuance.

22. 81. 100. 17

The third years tithing was Judicial, a Statute for the Poor; and so continues in its equitable foundation, that a due provision be made by Law for the Poor; whom we have always with us.

22. 81. 100. 17

There remains now only that to the Levites to be inquired after, what appearance there is in the Laws about it for us to conclude, either for, or against the perpetual right of them; the Scripture that contains those Laws, if I have not been strangely overseen in my Search, are three and no more, Lev. 27. 30, 31, 32, 33. Num. 18. 21, 24, 31, and Deut. 18. 1. Not many leaves these among the Levitical Statutes, though if many leaves had been found of them in Moses Law, they would not therefore have been presently Ceremonial; unless it were proved they were there as branches of the Ceremonial Law, and then one leaf, yea one Verse would serve the same.

Now in none of these Scriptures do we find the Original Law, but only resolutions about the disposal of them, supposed due to God by a former right; and therefore the cessation of these Laws and how removed out of the way, will only alter this disposal of them, but never overthrow Gods right in them, which they do not constitute but suppose. That in Lev. 27. 30. tells us, it is the Lords, it is holy to the Lord; therefore not to be alienated, Verse 31, 32, 33. God challengeth his right to them already in being, and the Statute forbids encroachment upon that right; and this is, I think, the first time these Tithes are mentioned in Moses Law; and here we are referred to an higher claim, in which if nothing Ceremonial have appeared, then what ever becomes of these Scriptures, Tithes must stand still, their foundation root being not plucked up, though these after-authorities should lose their binding force.

What the other two Scriptures determine, is not material to this inquiry, because though they should speak never so peremptorily in commanding them, yet they can be only confirmations establishing what is on foot already, and so must follow the Original one; for a

thing can be Originally commanded but once: we have found them before in the Law of Moses, and there also in the current; not in the well-head of them; for that we must seek higher than *Moses* if we would find it out; and I am persuaded, no man can fix his foot with any certainty of resolution sooner then the beginning of the world.

And yet neither in them have we any Law commanding them from the people; but that supposed, and upon that the people offering them to the Lord (of debt now at this time, it is on all hands resolved on, not of free gift) And God assigning them to *Levi* for his service in the Tabernacle, as for *Dent. 18. 1.* it is a short summe of *Num. 18. The Priests to eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire*, as in the beginning of *Num. 18.* it is at large declared; all the *Tribe of Levi* shall eat the *Lords inheritance*, as is declared at large, *Num. 18. 21.*

There are two rights found in these Laws; one from the people to God, and that right is supposed; the other from God to the Levites, and that right is stated, and *de novo* expressed here: be it then that *Levi's* service of the Tabernacle, for which this assignement was made, is ceased, and so the assignement with it, which is the later right; yet we want still the evidence of Gods giving up his right from the people: surely it should be shown not only where they cease to be *Levi's*, but where they cease to be Gods; they come to *Levi* at the second hand, and Gods right is a distinct right from *Levi's*, was before *Levi's*, and it would be inquired into, how it comes not to be Gods since; let the Detainers of Tithes show where God hath released them of this tribute.

Neither let the excellent *Capell.* object here that we owe our selves, and all we have to God and Christ, *quanti quanti, unde* for as this is most true now (and we desire to acknowledg it most equal, that we make out all his, who hath made his all ours) so it was ever more most true; and yet God reserved unto himself a special right to Tithes, as sufficient to testify our homage, and support his Worship, who would have none shut the doors of his house for nought, nor kindle a fire on his Altar for nought; there being enough left besides for the subsistence of them that used the Land under God, and were to live upon it: so it was then needful, and it appears that so it was done; so it is needful still upon the very same grounds, and notwithstanding what this reason produceth to the contrary, so it is still. Besides should not the most learned man remember, that the reason alledged is as strong in the point of time, as it is in the point of goods?

Neither let others object this special right to be from the Jews only, as who held their Land of God by a peculiar gift, and because of the wonderful Fruitfulness of the Land. I cannot see any truth in the assertion: for can any man imagine that *Abraham* alone paid

paid Tithes to *Molech* and the *Law* also is as the *Law* is to the *Brotherly*; and the reason is equal to all that will have God for their God, that they should callise their homages on him, and maintain his Worship as well as the *Jews*. And for the reason of this assertion they seem of no weight.

The first, in that all Nations hold their Lands of God as well as the *Jews*, though not led to them by such mighty signs.

2. And *Abraham* paid his Tithes out of the spoiles of war, if the word be duly rendered.

3. Had not then 3 foot of promised land, which he could call his own when he paid his Tithes.

4. *Jacobs* vow was out of all that God should give him.

5. All that is said for the right of personal Tithes, overthrows this pleading.

6. This reason is nowhere assigned by God for the payment of Tithes by the *Jews*.

7. Others are.

8. If this were assigned, yet others are the principal, and of a perpetual and universal obligation; so this is *gratia dictum*.

And the second reason hath as little weight as the first; for admit it all, it will only prove an Obligation to a lesser proportion, as lands are less in Fruitfulness; and what Scripture encouragement can any have to give less than a tenth? If *New Testament* Examples oblige us to any thing, it is sure to much more than a tenth, as I shall show anon; what there was therefore of special Fruitfulness in that land above others, had a charge of people answering it, yea exceeding it; so there was as little to spare for the *Levites* as out of other lands, where the increase might be less, and the people fewer indeed, considering how few the *Levites* were, and what Provision was made for them in the eight and forty Cities with their Suburbs, and the many ways that land was otherwise charged by God, of which there is some taste given above; reason would advise, let the *Levite* be contented with his settled Patrimony, wherein he fareth much better than any of his Brethren, and let him relinquish Tithes altogether; but so it seemed not good in the eye of God, but rather that whoever served him in peculiar services, should have peculiar encouragements beyond their Brethren, that his house may not be worn out, nor the *Levitical* what a weariness is it? But why in such a fruitful land as through Gods blessing ours is, should the Fruitfulness of *Canaan* be given as a reason, why a tenth should not be paid among us as it was among them? God cease our murmurings for the great plenty now for diverse years afforded us, and make us never grudge God his portion, which we never gave him, else we may quickly hear of a fruitful land turn'd into barrenness for the wickedness of them that dwell therein.

I never

Pl. 107. 34.

I never heard of any yet undone by paying of Tithes; very Heathens have thought otherwise as well as Jews; I have heard of Families thought to be undone by alienating from God to themselves; and from Sacred uses to common.

So then Gods they were and are from the people; be the Levites claim under God never so Ceremonial: if he never gave them up, then are they his still.

Move we now a step further, and see into this very assignment of Gods to Levi: we shall find a respect it beares to certain uses, and

Num. 18. 21.

to certain persons; for the respect it hath to uses, what saith the deed? for their service which they serve, so in general; then it follows even the service of the tabernacle of the Congregation; that bring what for the present they attended upon, including in it al their temple services,

1 Chro. 25. and

26. 26; 30, 32.

much diverse from those under the Tabernacle) wherein they served God; some in the Temple in several offices, others waited on the service of the Lord in the Provinces, in all the business of the Lord, and in every matter pertaining to God: And no sober man, I hope, will say, Tithes respected one part of their service, and that the meanest, and not all and every part: if any should, Miser himself will re-buffe him, who makes Levi's teaching judgements; and Gods Law the prime consideration for? which he prays the Lord to bless his substance? before he mentions the incense; and the whole burnt-offering.

Deut. 33. 10.

11.

And what were those judgements? only how to behave themselves in the Ceremonies of Gods worship? for one; and he a Friend of Tithes too; but most unadvisedly; there was not so great need to set Levites in the Provinces for that; and the poor people needed teaching in something else, which being more excellent and difficult, would rather deserve honourable wages; then all that they performed besides; and if God did not suffer any to kindle a fire on his Altar for naught, much lesse was he likely to suffer the Levites to take pains for naught in endeavouring by the Doctrines of Faith, Repentance, and a new life of obedience, to save the souls of people.

2 Chro. 17. 8.

9.

The conclusion of this matter is; that all the work of the Levites nor being Ceremonial; the chiefest and best which deserves greatest wages being, for the substance of it, moral and perpetual Faith in the Messiah; and obedience to Gods everlasting Laws: and there being no other reward for this service but this common use of Tithes and God not likely to set them about a work; and give them no present visible wages, which in no other service he ever did; and it being no sufficient answer, to say that by other means for other services they were provided already; therefore no need of a new assignment for this moral service; for so they would have been in their right; and forry Clarks with their Suburbs, though they had no Tithes at all.

It follows that the use of Tithes in this assignment respected

not

not only a service of a temporary Ceremonial, but of a moral perpetual nature; and though the temporary use is now done with, yet the Law will still abide in its principal perpetual uses, though the accessory be vanished; especially when the pains which is taken away by the ceasing of one, is abundantly added to the Ministers of Gods holy things in the other.

And if any say, that because there was some respect to a Ceremonial service, though that not the only nor the principal, that therefore it is fit they should be nailed to Christs Cross together with other Ceremonies; I would advise him, to consider what one duty that is most moral in his own account did not share in, and sympathize with the peculiar dispensation of those times; instance in prayer, a moral duty if any; yet turning the body, and lifting up the hand towards the holy land, towards *Jerusalem*, towards the house that is called by Gods name, and towards the holy Temple; these and other things, even in prayer were Ceremonial; instance in what you will; some thing will appear to have been appendant to it, though the body of the duty be not so; therefore forbear nailing Tithes to the

Dan. 6. 10.

1 Kin. 8. 29,

20, 33, 35, 38,

48.

P. 5. 7.

Crosse of Christ, among other Ceremonies upon this account; till we can tell how to rescue all other duties from following them the same way. No; that whose use is merely, or at least principally to shadow, let that cease as having its consummation at the Crosse of Christ; but let not that be dealt so with which hath another perpetual use for its principal design, and which alone is sufficient to support its standing, because of some Ceremonialness annexed, suitable to the nature of those things; for then we deface all, it is as if we should

So then the right of Gods Tithes remains yet firm, and the assignement of them for such uses remains good, as to the principal use; and the ceasing of the rest overthrowes not the very assignement, much lesse the Original Law, by which they are due to God.

Num. 18. 21.

P. 10.

Eph. 5. 3, 4.

Yet again consider the assignement, in respect of the persons to whom it was made; *David* gave the Children of *Levi*. To omit the merry jesting Triumphs we meet with here. (only saying thus much in a serious cause against many that hold the same foundation with us jesting, and that with bitterness is not convenient, and does ill become Saints) yet thus much may with reason be affirmed;

That Tithes were not assigned to *Levi* as *Levi*, but as set apart for the service of the Lord; let him be removed, and others set apart, the very reason which gave them him, *qua* set apart, will give them that too: this service is altered, a service remains; this service is altered in its inferior duties, in its superiour and most noble duties tis still the same; repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ (diversely indeed Preached, as the diversity of times was, but the substance of the duty one) and the assignement in re-

See

E

ference

service to their service, who with such additions and alterations, as it should please God from time to time to make, as he did, both in what they were to teach, first *Moses*, afterwards the Prophets added: first Tabernacle service, afterwards Temple service (a great alteration) the maintenance in all changes abiding the same.

Is. 66: 21.

The line of the Priesthood we find altered, but how? by losing the reward of their Ministerial service, in case of receiving him whom they hitherto had Preached, and being sent forth by him to teach others to receive him also: we want a proof of this: the change was not in losing any thing they formerly enjoyed; but by taking in others of other Tribes and Nations, as it was Prophesied, and the time of fulfilling Types, and removing partition Walls, being now come required; so others are joyned with them to share in the same service (for substance) by the same authority; why then they should not share in the same reward, removing what is to be removed, and letting the rest stand, I ask a reason: Let me put a case; suppose God had abrogated sacrifice, and communicated the Priesthood, in chosen persons out of every Tribe, not taking all of Levi, nor confining it to Levi, both these before the coming of Christ in the Flesh, which he might have done; the Doctrine of Faith in the *Messias* to none still remaining, it had made no change of the maintenance, but left it standing still: would any man say, that the still standing maintenance must not be the portion of the now present Priests? especially if no new provisions were made for them? No reasonable man, I think, would say so; that which might have been done then, is done now; and therefore plain it is, that so far as the assignment goes, we are not excluded from the benefit of it; upon the reason forementioned. (with Master *Sellins* good leave) and whoever will pluck Tithes out of our hands, must plead an alteration in the Gospel, supposed to be made in this matter, and must not rest in any thing barely producible out of this assignment to Levi. What is added about Tithes, in the *Old Testament*, is little helpful to the cause of them that plead against Tithes; being the confirmation of them by the voice of God, and the Edicts of Kings and Governours, of which we shall speak in the second plea; we may then draw all that hath been said into these summary conclusions.

1. That when Tithes were first due to God, is nowhere to be found; we suppose it was Gods reserved Rent from the beginning.
2. That *Moses* indeed had a just right in Tithes from God, and not from the free gift of man.
3. That this right was neither by Law Ceremonial, nor Judicial, but moral and perpetual.
4. That Gods right in Tithes began not with the *Levitical Priesthood*, they had only from him the assignment of the use of them.
5. That the expiration of this assignment to the *Levitical Priesthood*.

head will neither shew us Gods right (If he have taken them from Levi, he hath not therefore given them away from himself) nor to take the same to Melchizedek and his Priesthood.

6. That Gospel Ministers may claim Tithes from this assignment to Levi. (at least in the equivable construction of it) as appointed to serve God in his house, though not as Levites race, nor for Ceremonial services from all that are, or ought to be, taught by, and would be accounted the Israel of God, any thing to be found in this assignment to the contrary notwithstanding.

I shall but step aside, to consider in brief that question, whether Tithes were not commanded under Moses by a Law Judicial? and then I shall follow our Adversaries in this cause, to their pretences for a change in New Testament times. Our engagement with them that plead the Judicial Law, is not so necessary, seeing to bring in a Judicial Law again, is not to deny Christ come in Flesh; all that would have the Judicial Law rule all, upon this supposition, would yield us a Divine right in them; and none but upon the Foundation of equity, upon which Judicials are built, would grant us rather more than less. Yet let it not be injurious to the many great names of them at home and abroad, who are of this persuasion, if I proposed my doubts, though not very necessary to the cause at hand. They seem to me not to have been due under Moses by a Judicial Law, for these reasons.

1. They could not be Judicial, as paid by the people to Gods Mal. 2. 8. 9) whence it is called a robbing of God to detain them, nor yet as they were given by God to Levi. Judicials order things from man to man, not from man to God, nor from God to man.

2. Judicials began with Moses politic (such as were meedy so) at least with Abrahams Family becoming a people; for Political Laws suppose a body Politick to be Governed by them; but so time to be found, wherein Tithes began to be Gods, but the beginning of the world.

3. Judicials (properly so taken) concerned the Jews only, but Tithes not so; it is not to be imagined, that Abraham only paid Tithes to Melchizedek, he was a Priest to many besides Abraham, and from them was this due as much as from him.

There is but one Politick reason, as I know of, given, why the Law for Tithes should be Judicial, and first given by the old Scholmen; it is this, that by this means a proportion might be found one for Levi, who else had no inheritance among his Brethren; no great wonder this from the Scholmen; but that River should tell us among other reasons, this is (the forementioned) *sax & precipas*, is to be wondered at; one and the Chief, and another reason named? and this not named once? nay the quite contrary expected? It was not because they had no inheritance, therefore they should have Num. 18. 21.

Num. 18. 21.

Reynolds on
Psa. 110. p. 477.

Tithes; but because they had Tithes, therefore they should have no maintenance. I would gladly know what politick reason would advise the Levites maintenance rather thus, then by giving them a distinct share answerable to their numbers among their Brethren. And if a maintenance this way were a matter of police, why such a maintenance as gave a tenth proportion to them who were just the 49. part, as long as we live, scarce the 60. as *Bellarmine*, no consideration had of the charges and labour of them that occupied the land? Rather one would think upon that politick ground which respects the equal provision of the Tribes: Tithes ought to have been wholly laid aside, they having 48 Cities with their Suburbs, about a mile about, some of which were Royal Cities, which was a proportion far exceeding any of the other Tribes, considering the Quiescence of their numbers. So far is this reason from being *precipitous*, the chief, that it is not so much as *ana*, no reason at all, neither can it be equalled with *ana*. We are now arrived at Gospel-times hitherto. Tithes are come along with us without any stop or contradiction. It is now to be enquired what becomes of them, whether they waxe old now, and are ready to vanish, or abide in full force and vertue. I shall lay down what I conceive to be the resolution of the Gospel in the matter of Ministers Maintenance in these following Conclusions.

P. 16.

1. That Gospel-Ministers have a maintenance that is due to them of Right, and not of Alms. This will passe now *Nemine contradicente*, I am sure not my neighbour, who acknowledges a portion, though he stick at the proportion.

P. 4.

1 Cor. 9. 14.
Gal. 6. 6.
1 Tim. 5. 8.
1 Cor. 9. 7.

Neb. 13. 10.

Capel charges other *Anabaptists* with this vile saying; but my Neighbour shall stand acquitted of it for me. Nay he tells us, That it is to be feared, that that faith will not avail to salvation in Christ, which doth not avails to the maintenance of his Ministers: I feare so, to, if the disobeying Christs ordinance, and the Apostles precepts; if highest ingratitude to them that shew us the highest mercy; if defrauding the labourer of his hire (the hire, not of his work, but of his paines; and the souldier of his pay, the planter of his fruit, and the shepherd of his milk; if robbing God of his tribute due to him out of the good things he hath given us (on all hands something reserved, though we differ about the how, and the how much) in the ruining of our own, and many soules besides, while the services of God are either wholly neglected; or contemptibly admittred for want of food in the Lords house. But if this, and much more, be enough to ground such a fear; I think justly; and this the more, because it is a duty without controversie; no sober man debates it; no error can excuse the omission of it; a duty easily known; we reach it not by a long chain of curious consequences which may tire a man of an ordinary understanding before he can come

come at his duty to discern it: 'tis as plain as the souldiers pay, the husbandmans bread, the shepherds fleece, the labourers hire: The neglect of it therefore no ignorance can excuse, as well as no error; it must lie wholly upon the will; its profaneness, or covetousness, or both. Yet if any, meerly out of a careless inadvertency of their duty, have fallen into this sin, I hope upon this joynt admonition, they will be awakened to reform it; and will know from henceforth, that God hath his rent due to him as well as the Landlord; and that the Ministers right is as much a debt as any mans: So may they expect God should look down with a blessing on their habitations; as they bring out thence that which is holy, as something there is of that nature confessed on all hands. *Deu. 26. 13, 15*

Further, as Alms was not the appointed maintenance for Gospel-Ministers *de jure*; so neither was it the maintenance of the Apostolic Churches *de facto*; they did not plead the *Jm*, and use a meer benevolence. Even *Carleton* here is our, and his Instances are mistaken; for they concern not contributions to the Ministry, but to *Rom. 15. 26, 27*, the poor Saints at *Jerusalem*; and if of them his reason be admitted *Acts 24. 16*, red good, that they of *Macedonia*, and *Achaia*, and *Rome*, were not bound in any other duty then meer charity to maintain those at *Jerusalem* (it should be, not *Rome*, as it is falsely printed) yet I hope he will not say so of the Minister; and even of the poor Saints *Rom. 15. 27*, at *Jerusalem* the Apostle seems to mention another debt besides that of charity. It alwayes took the debtors there to be, not the receivers, as he; but the payers for all it pleased them: and do so still; neither can it be otherwise, the Gentile partaking of the *Jews* spiritual things, ought to minister to them (the *Jews*) in their carnal things. To me it seemes a contradiction, to affirm a thing due in justice, yet paid of Alms; and the foundation *Carleton* lays will not carry home the conclusion; for no man was compelled to give any thing, but every man gave as he was moved: All this is not sufficient to make an Almes. Suppose a Magistracy so corrupt, that an honest man may not by suit recover upon a bond lawfully due; yet the Creditor faithfully paying in this bond upon the force of a good conscience, may not be rightly said to give an Almes: But if any will call this so, he may call the other so too: Yet I should call both debts of justice.

2. That this due maintenance ought to arise out of all the goods of *Gal. 6. 6*: them that are taught, none excepted; so neither the Tenants crop, priviledged by sinful customes, or unpriviledged, nor the Tradesmans gain, nor the Landlords rent (the tenth increase being none of his goods; therefore though something be given out of the whole increase, yet that something is nothing out of the Landlords goods, he must give a portion out of his Rent, if he give any thing.) None of these exempted; the Apostles all goods forbids any thing

to

to be privileged from this duty, and cancel what is already. This Conclusion also we have free from the contradiction of bad principles; could we easily free it from the contradiction of bad practices, we should not have such eager necessitous suing from all parts for Argumentations as we have. I desire thousands to consider how well they acquire themselves of this plain confessed Law of God. I say not that these things should be done to me; yet a Right it is.

P. 18.

3. That the quantity of the proportion which every man is to give out of his goods, is not left to the mind and heart, the discretion and pleasure of him that is to give. This Conclusion is contradictory to your whole Book, my Friend and Neighbour, and therefore I shall pursue it thoroughly and closely. Let me tell you, at the beginning, that the mind and will of the giver is a vile word, a very vile word, and must be repented of, though it be the principle into which your whole Book is resolved; the free-will offering neither determined by God nor man, is no otherwise; as it excludes mans determination, I shall deal with it hereafter, as it excludes Gods, I have this place to deal with it in. And first I shall assert my own conclusion, then remove out of the way what you have said in defence of yours.

1. I take this to be a necessary inference from the first Conclusion; for if the mind and heart of the giver be the rule determining the something commanded in its proportion; then whatever is given more than a small matter above nothing, is meer Alms: For had we given out of all our goods the worth of a single penny, and had a mind and heart to give no more, we had done what is justice we are required, the Law being something, and the rule of measure our own mind and heart: The rest then is meer Alms, a gift of charity.

Luke 10.7.
1 Cor. 9.7.

2. The similitudes Christ and Paul use in this matter, seem to me to import as much: The Labourers hire, and the Soldiers pay are not left to the pleasure of those they labour and fight for. Yet either is more reasonable than that Ministers should be left to the pleasure of those sinners whose sins they fight against; as soon leave the souldier for his pay to the pleasure of the enemy, nay rather; for an enemy will love a gallant adversary; but the more able and faithful Christs souldier is, the more will the sinner hate him: I desire the Gentlemen of the Souldiery to consider this.

3. The Excellency of the Ministry of the Gospel seems to bear out my Conclusion. God never did yet leave his Ministers, of what Order soever, to the pleasure of men, how much they would give them: And Christs Ordinance is even so; that is not (I hope) then commanded; how not commanded? that's a wide Exposition

tion of the even so, Neighbour, though it be yours.

But what need we insist upon these things, when we have plain commands determining other proportions, not this. And those determinations are either

1 Cor. 9. 14.
The Arch-Bishop reasoning
with Thorp
upon this ground
is not to be
contemned.

1. On the people side; not as they have a mind and will, but as they have a power, 1 Cor. 16. 2. 2 Cor. 8. 3, or
2. On the Ministers side more then one. 1. He must live, 1 Cor. 9. 14. And this is more then the minde and heart of every giver will afford; many had rather see the witnesses carcasses upon the ground, that they may be rid of their Tormentors. 2. But they must not barely live as men, but as Christians, so providing for their own, as that when that they are gone, their children and widows may not be chargeable to the Church. None but will allow thus much out of 1 Tim. 5. 8. though many covetous wretches have filthily abused it (and doe) to most exorbitant boundless provisions for, not the lives, but the lusts of theirs. 3. They must live as Ministers.

1. Answerably to the dignity of their Calling, 1 Tim. 5. 17. not meer necessity is to be regarded in the maintenance of him that labours in the Word and Doctrine, but honourableness.

2. Answerable to the expensiveness of their Calling, which requires their whole time, 1 Tim. 4. 15. their whole endeavours, no intangling businesse of life allowed to distract him from it, 2 Tim. 2. 4.

3. A stock in Books must be dead by him, sufficient to set up many a considerable Trade; even Paul had his parchments. None are busier in Printing, then those men who quarrel so much against Ministers Books: It seemes theirs must be bought up and read, but no mans else; these men are unreasonably impudent. 2 Tim. 4. 13.

4. Hospitality and mercy to the poor is enjoined him, and that not to be shirked of with a Let him doe as he is able; 1 Tim. 3. 2. for he ought to be able that he may doe it. The poore will expect it from him, whether he hath it or no; and if he tell them he is not able, they will not believe him; reason fills not hungry bellies, but food; and if we have it for them, we shall marvellously further the entertainment of the Gospel by our freeness in communicating; and if we have it not, or they receive it not, it will be as great an hindrance.

5. He must speak, exhort, rebuke with all authority, and not let any despise him; which that Minister that depends upon the meer pleasure of his hearers, for the bread he eat, is not like to doe, at least shall be in a great temptation
Tit. 2. 15.

Priests Catech.

tion to deale insincerely with wealthy Benefactors, upon whole trencher he lives. That wretch whom Mr. Rogers of Dedham speaks of, who offered at a Communion a brasse farthing, communicated something of his goods, and as much likely as he had a minde and a heart to; according to your rule. Neighbour that man sinn'd not: But God is not mocked.

So then certain it is that God hath not left us to the mind and will of these that are taught by us; God hath set other bounds to a peoples duty then to doe as they list: It is to their Power, and if need be, beyond their power; on the Ministers side, that he may live, and live honourably; that he may be furnished with necessary helps to his Ministry, that he may minde his service wholly, and not be distracted with care how to get bread for his family; that he may be an example of charity to others, and an encourager of the poor in the love of godliness that he may be free from the despisings of poor profane ones, and from the proud, insolencies of the rich profane ones; that he may provide honestly for his own, and not leave behind him those that shall be burdensome to the Church when he is gone: So much as will answer all this are Gods bounds, not the mind and heart of the giver.

Let us now see exactly and curiously all that is said for this monstrous licentious Doctrine. I finde some things taken to this purpose out of the *Old*, and some things out of the *New Testament*.

Out of the *Old Testament* we have

1. Examples. The people offering willingly for the Tabernacle, and for the Temple.

Ans^r. True, we finde free-will offerings here, and many times elsewhere, even in Sacrifices themselves; and we find stinted contributions also under the *Old Testament* as well; must of necessity one justify the other in the *New Testament*, which stood so friendly together in the *Old*? Or if they cannot agree now, one must give ground; Let Gods command mainrain the field, and mans Free-will go off; it is but good manners so to do: A voluntary act may expire without much ado, but a command of Gods not so easily; especially when the free-will offerings mentioned were single extraordinary acts, once done, and no more: whereas the Law was for a perpetual standing duty; and if a pattern be to be drawn for Ministers maintenance under the Gospel from what was done under the Law, it should rather be a standing provision, imitating a standing provision, rather then what was special and extraordinary; Ministers maintenance rather imitating Ministers maintenance, then something else, *Moses* preparing for the Tabernacle, or *David* for the

P. 17. 18.

Exo. 35. 5, 21,

22, 29..

1 Chr. 29. 5.

the Temple; I will tell you my Friend, what conclusion I should draw from these instances.

That there is nothing in a free will-offering more Evangelical then in a Stint, that having been of use in the Tabernacle; in the Temple, & in Sacrifices too; then which nothing more Ceremonial. And I will tell you what manner of proof would have been to your purpose; could you have made it good, that a free will-offering was never used in the *Old Testament*, and a Stint alwayes; whereas a free will-offering was alwayes used in the *New Testament*, and a Stint never; but if we find both under both administrations; it seems the wayes are in themselves indifferent to either.

2. Your second *Old Testament* proof is from *Dauids Command* to *I Chro. 28. 9.* Solomon, to serve the Lord with a willing mind. And the third is like to this; a Prophecy that Christs people should be a willing people in the day of his power; a weighty proof, no lesse then six times repeated; what's the conclusion thence? it must be this, that God hath left his Ministers maintenance undetermined to the free will of them that are taught; if any way of concluding this out of these Scriptures, it must be thus: If God hath left the greater to the free will of men, much more the lesse; if no Law determining us in serving the Lord, nor in submitting to the Rule of Christ, then not in maintaining the Ministers; we admit the consequence; for should men be more under engagements to us then they are to God? But we abhorre the Antecedent; what? God nor determine us by his Command in the matter of his own service, and of subjection to his Son: but leave us in such high things to our own minds and hearts? Many Sons of *Belial* would fain have it so, and those men that cast off Scripture guidance, and count nothing sin but what they think so, have found out a way to perswade themselves it is so: But for you Neighbour, I do not think you to be so wicked; 'tis an Hackney reason this, in every ignorant mans mouth, and you took it up in the High-way, without examining it. The willingness in these Scriptures hath an opposition to constraint, not to a Command: Alas that you should not see this! Come I know, you will rectifie this mistake; you will not dispute down all Gods and Christs Laws, under pretence of disputing down Tithes. I know you will not try now, whether any better success may be hoped, for out of *New Testament* Arguments; they are

1. That Command of Christ, *Math. 10. 8.* which we are thrice told of.

Ans. I. This Commission of Christ to the Apostles was not intended in all things to be a standing Law to the Church; the charge Verse 9. 10. was extraordinary; the extent of their bounds to which they were confined was a straitned Compass, Verse 5. 9. and their Commission temporary, it being to be with him, and that he might send them forth to Preach; occasionally in all likelyhood, and where *Mat. 3. 14.*

himself did intend to come; others will tell you this, and it will be hard to prove that this *freely* Verse 8. is not of the same nature as the *without Shoes*, Verse 10.

I I. But I give you this answer, that the Apostles were to heal the Sick, &c. *freely*; and that *freely* was by neither demanding any thing for their Cures wrought, nor yet taking any thing; had but thus much been permitted them, the Apostles might have grown exceeding rich, and the miracles would have lost their end, becoming a meer trade to get money by: tis dayly seen that multitudes of ordinary Physicians grow very rich by taking only, without ever demanding any thing of a Patient, who often refuse, and never ask; the word *freely* imports it, and so they had received; Christ in the Communitating this power to them neither asked nor took; you would not have this a rule for Teaching too? if you would Christs own expresse words at the close of Verse 10. contradict you. I hope now you will let this Scripture go; the *freely* is another thing then what you took it to be, and does concern another matter.

2. The rest of instances to establish your free will offering, are from the History of the Acts, and the Epistles.

P. 3.
Act. 24. 17.

2 Cor. 8. 1. They were willing to Contribute to Paul say you, nay do not thus deceive men that are willing to trust you upon your word; the gift was to the Saints, and Paul was but a Messenger among others, to convey it to them, Verse 4. of this speaks also Prov. 11. 25. and which Scripture another mentions, though you do not, Rom. 15. 27. it was to the poor Saints at Jerusalem: this it seems a debt too, and it is well it pleased them to do their duty, to all which I say only thus much, that Ministers are not the peoples Almshouses, and that there is a wide difference between the poor of Churches, and the Rulers of Churches. That matters of charity should be determined by the discreet tender-heartedness of the giver may be allowed, but that matters of strict Justice should be so left at liberty, will by no means be hence concluded, and though the learned *Capel*. fetch the Ministers maintenance out of these Contributions to the Poor; this will hardly be made good by a clear Scripture proof in the Churches of the Gentiles (the *Jewish* had all things in common) and yet it will not help the cause, it is produced for by him, and may be by others; for though payed both at once, they are payments distinct in nature, having several grounds, and several measures to direct, and determine conscience, by as much as if they were paid never so much asunder.

P. 18.

Yet this instance is made a Rule for all Churches to walk by, and to this purpose 1 Cor. 7. 17. and 1 Cor. 4. 17. are produced; neither of which speak to the matter of maintenance particularly, if at all. Now (to see the unhappiness of this man in all his reasonings) be all this granted that the Ministers maintenance is no otherwise determined

gained by God then the Poor; and that the Apostles Ordinance about this, in one Church is a Rule for all Churches; it will then deserve an inquiry, to know what that Ordinance was: this we must take at the first Original Law about it, not upon an after-Act upon special reasons varying in one particular from the first general constitution; That we find a punctual Law indeed, and pretty general, 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. but this runs quite in another strain; the Rule is determinate, and a very strait one too; *'e n d' s' u d d' i' r' a' z*, not as God hath prospered him in (yet that is not the proportion of the heart, and mind of the Giver) but whatever he hath thriven in; the whole increase of their stock in trading that week; uncertain, you will say that, and whether we will or no, we must leave it to mens wills and consciences, *unius cuiusque arbitrio & conscientia*; what shall we leave so, most Excellent *Capel*? not the Law, that's determined in the Text, it must be his obedience to the Law; and that the Apostle left indeed not to mens wills (that's unhandsome, that word *arbitrio*) but to their consciences, that they deal faithfully in obedience to his Command, to the utmost of their knowledge; and for this *Qud; s' u n n e i' s' t' u*, is a caveat sufficient indeed. Answer this to that learned mans exception about personal Tithes, for which he brings those words.

This being the Laws in *Corinth*, it met with a proud sturdy covetous people, with whom the whole increase of a great gainful trading that City flourished in, would have amounted to too great a summe for an evil eye contentedly to part with; the Apostle having notice of it, and their proneness upon every occasion to division, through the influence false Teachers had among them, takes quite another course in the second Epistle from what he used in the first; not commanding them peremptorily without a reason, nor appointing them what to give in any sense of the words; but because of the hardness of their hearts, leaving them free in the summe, and endeavouring to raise them up another way, by many most melting Arguments in two whole Chapters, which course he had omitted altogether before; so it appears, this was a special indulgence upon special causes, relaxing the rigour of a severe Canon to the *Corinthians*, and to them only, as to all other Churches remaining in its full force & vertue. You will say, this could not last long, for men to bear all the losses in trading themselves, and others to carry away all the gain; true, no more it did not, the order it self expresses its own expiration; when the Apostle came to carry away their charity to *Jerusalem*, and for what I can see to the contrary, it was but one weeks burden; so far is it from being a perpetual Law for Ministers maintenance, that it was not so much as a perpetual Law for Collections for the Poor; so exceeding inconsiderable is this allegation to the purpose in hand; yet one place there is which speaks to the Ministers maintenance indeed. *Phil.*

Arian. Epist.

l. 4. 15. Proclaim that thou art at peace with all men, ora d' n o m' s' t, whatever they do to thee.

4. 17, 18, 19. & we find diverse such in the *Old Testament* (to Prophets especially) which were never therefore pleaded Rules, that so it ought to be done alwayes, and no other wise; yet this is plainly and fully to the instance.

Payments to Ministers are either out of duty to supply them, as God hath Commanded them to be supplied; these have their measures bounded, and not left arbitrary to the discretion and will of the people: Other payments are out of courtesy, as Testimonies of that love and kindness, which is comely good people should, and many do bear to their Ministers; these are altogether arbitrary, a little signifying love as well as much. Which of these two sorts the *Philippians* were, does depend upon the knowledge of the Apostles then stare; if not necessitous, we may admire the free will-offering in this place, it being an Act of courtesy and Christian care; if necessitous (as it seems by Verse 14. and 16.) the Gift was not free, but a matter of plain duty (will any deny this?) bounded as hath been forementioned, and smelt never the worse in Gods nostrils for being Commanded; and having an other Rule and measure besides mans own will.

See v. 10. 14. The summe of this is, Contribution to the Apostle, in a necessitous condition, was in it self a duty, in its measure so far as it had a correspondency with Gods bounds, then pointed out and known, as hath been declared, that was a duty too; if in any thing their bounty exceeded, this will be referred to their courtesy, and was indeed a free Gift; and as then, so it is now, the Saint does not thrust out the free Gift, if men have hearts to exceed.

P. 2. P. 18. But these are the Sacrifices alone which are accepted with God; that only, and God accepts no other; it must needs be so then indeed, we have cause to look to that; see what's brought to convince us.

1 Chro. 28. 9. Again that? What will not serving the Lord be accepted, unlesse without a Command? if will-worship become the only acceptable worship in your account, how at randome do you write?

1 Chro. 29. 5, 6, 9. Accepted no doubt these were, but the word only is wanting; there were other Laws, acknowledged at that time, and were these snares to men? they must obey them because Laws, but they could not be accepted in their obedience to them, because Laws too? Oh do not write so reproachfully to the goodness of God.

2 Cor. 9. 14. and 8. 1. Contribution is called a grace, and that to their power, Verse 2. was a grace enabling them to do their duty, if the Apostle reason well, Rom. 15. 27. beyond their power was grace, enabling them to an uncommanded Act of mercy; obedience to just Commands is of grace:

grace : Where there is a *Te must needs be subject* ; this done *Rem. 13. 4.*
for conscience sake is a grace , and accepted too : is it not
so? Still here wants the only.

Phil. 4. 17, 18, 19. The free Gift is an odour ; phy. why put
you in the word free? 'tis the Gift, and that of duty ; and
yet the word only is not here : yea though I heed it well,
it is not here ; there can indeed be no safe account without
we do our duty *freely*, as it hath an opposition to coercion
and constraint ; but as freely hath an opposition to a Law
or Command (in which sense we dispute about it) that
saying, there can be no safe account without it, is not so true,
though he that gives no more. then he must needs by the
Laws of God and man, had need see that his parcimoni-
ousness proceed not from want of love, for that will render
his account unsafe.

P. 2.
P. 18.

Prov. 11. 25. The covetous man gives neither one way nor
other by his good will, and we need not inquire how that
will be accepted that is not ; as for the liberal mans *supera-*
bundant charity to the poor, of which that Scripture mainly
speaks, accepted it will be no doubt ; so also his hearty
and willing Contribution, when he is Commanded to it by
Law of God or man : what you adde, God accepts of no o-
ther, nor will blesse or water no other, is no conclusion
from the Text ; the like of the liberal mans maintaining his
Minister, which is no matter of charity.

P. 18.

If. 66. 3. The Lord will have no Sacrifice but what himself
chooseth ; who hath required this? *If. 1. 11.* Why these
were all Commanded duties, and were therefore not ac-
cepted, because unduely performed ; the Texts themselves
give you the reason, why they were vain and hated. *If. 1.*
15. & 66. 3, 4. And here also we plead a Command, and you
plead against it, by telling us God accepteth no service but
what himself chooseth : why man, you forget your side you
are engaged for ; just so would you speak were you on our
side, and we take the Argument to be probable enough, and
conclude therefore he hath bounded it, because he is most
likely to know what will please himself, and most unlikely
in a thing that hath so near a correspondence with his own
worship, to leave men to the lusts of their own hearts, or
at best to the blindness of their own reason, what a wil-
derness are you in here? you are to prove that no coman-
ded proportion in a Ministers maintenance is accepted by
God in Gospel times ; and your reason is, no service uncom-
manded is accepted ; you adde also, going on as in a Maze,
but that which the Teaching of the Spirit brings forth in the

Faithful : Why the Teachings of the Spirit bring forth a conscientious obedience to Scripture Commands, that we as-
 firme in this very case, will not God accept of it for the
 Scripture Laws sake? sure in writing these things you were
 not well in your mind. And so much of Scripture grounds
 against the Commanded proportion.

P. 19.

Your reasons follow why that was done which was never done;
 all Saints removed and men left to their own minds and hearts. I
 might well spare them, for it is in vain to examine the *disin* when the
err is not. But you and yours shall never have cause to say that any
 thing produced stands unanswered; your reasons are not to ensnare
 his Ministers with lucre; a sin indeed inconsistent with the duty of a
 Minister: but hath God ever told us that a set maintenance would
 make men covetous? and that therefore he hath removed it? not a
 word; well, yet strong grounds for this are brought from reason; if
 any sound one, we will hear that too: no such thing neither; how then
 answer you this? shew it if you can; why? by the experience of ages:
 nay that will not prove the point; if Ministers be covetous, the cause
 is not without, in evil Laws, but within them, in evil hearts: take
 those hearts away, and let the Laws stand, Ministers will not be co-
 vetous: take away the Laws, and let the hearts remain, they will be
 covetous still; nay more, for the more uncertainty of their Provi-
 sions, the more will covetousness distract God; the more greedily
 will it take where it hath an opportunity; the more will it quarrel at
 the straits of mens purses; the more will it look upon other mens
 goods with an evil eye; the more unlimited will desire range, having
 no bounds from God or man; the more niggardly will it be in spend-
 ing, as not having any certainty of more coming in when this is gone.
 Every Minister will not do thus, should we be left at uncertainties,
 but every covetous Minister would; yet what if your experience of
 ages should prove partly frivolous, and partly slanderous?

For this man propound to make their Sons Scholars, and bles-
 sed be God, a certain subsistence encourages them so to do;
 but do all design to make them rich? assuredly they shall
 lay out five hundred £. upon that design this way most un-
 wisely, to make them serviceable to God, and live honestly
 they may, but this no covetousness, 'tis their flat duty.

If a Parson be sick what riding and running, &c. if from a peo-
 ple, blessed be their hearts, who are so careful of their
 own souls; and blessed be the heart of that Parson, who is
 as tender as such a people, as if he were in their stead, if from
 Ministers and their friends, no such heinous crime neither, if
 the desire be well grounded: yet in my Observation I have
 seen more good people inquire, where they shall find a good
 Minister; then good Ministers where they shall find good
 people, or a rich either.

In

1 Tim. 3. 1.

In our striving for *Parliament* men, the word was, Is he for Tithes? if he be, let us all voice for him: and pray, was not your word, Is he against Tithes? we may keep our own better without covetousness, then you can pull away what is not your own without covetousness. Yet what Minister was so indiscreet as to use those words, I know not; frivolous are these slanders, that you add of men of vast estates (if I am concerned in this I am sorry) my vast Estate is such an eye sore to you; I would you were less covetous, then it would not be so; yet if a Poor needy Farmer; I have taken you for a Farmer, but for a poor needy one I never took you for: cannot in conscience; trust me, I doubt that yet if you should tell your Land-lord, you cannot in conscience pay him Rent, I doubt he would not take himself bound to to accept of that answer; for the laying in Prison, it is not come to that; show your Tide to the goods you unrighteously detain; and if the resolution of Justice go on my side, I shall afterwards consider what mercy to show you: in the mean time know, that the Warrants which have been out against you, have been for contemning, and rebelling against the Lawful Commands of Authority, requiring your appearance, to show cause why you detain the goods in question in your hands, which thing no wit of man can excuse from sin; the rest of being worse then *Judas*, saying, thus much I will have (as if we may not be Masters of our own courtesies, and define how much less then a due we will take, without being worse then *Judas*): the Priests Boy, and the taking by force when a peaceable appeal to them, who by God and man are appointed, to end strife, is only used. *Judas* furnishing his table with what they freely gave not: what will you give me? should he so for what for selling of Christ? all these are Ravings which become not a sober Christian Pen; so men write when anger makes them weigh nothing, but how they may bite deepest, and most vex an Adversary. But I am not angry at the indignity of your comparison, much less shall I requite you railing with railing: I tell you truly how I am affected with it. I grieve at your sin, and pity your inconsiderateness; so I end your first reason, only requesting you to remember, that a Stinted maintenance is acknowledged by you, to have been Gods own maintenance; and you should take heed how you say that is a snare to covetousness.

Second Reason: Because compulsion should not be an obstruction, or hinderance to the Gentiles embracing the Gospel. The Gentiles? why not the *Jews* too? put them both in, the

the reason is the same; but it touches not the cause. The question is about a summe Stinted, as you terme it, not about the Ministers exacting the said summe, and compelling the unwilling to pay; men must first understand what the unsearchable Riches of Christ are, before they be perswaded to part with their riches for Christ, by any law, general or particular, of God or of man; this is well expressed by you that Ministers must forbear their own power, and lose their own right, and all to make the people in love with the ways of Christ: and this in challenging free contribution, yea and any other maintenance, 'tis all one; a commanded Stint unseasonably required would hinder the Gospel no more then a commanded free Contribution unseasonably required under penalty of damnation. Put me in the Apostles case, and if I then obey not the Apostles Example, let me lye under reproof: it were strange this to hear of Master *Edgor*, and Master *Edgor* Preachers to the newly converted *Indians*: that they converted maintenance from those they Preach to; what is done for the support of such Ministers must come from other Churches, and I hope does to them; should I professedly forbear you, in order to the making you in love with the ways of Christ you are turned aside from; would not you scorn the motion? I did it to you for above three years, and to many others to this day, yet I see not that you are the nearer to repentance for it.

Third Reason: Because that should be a badge by which Christ will have his Church known, even their willingness; this with all its proofs is answered already: the willingness of Christs Subjects consists not in having no Command, but in a free ready obedience to the Command: for the other, to call that the badge of Christs Subjects is no reason, is the very contrary question between us.

Fourth Reason: Because it should be a band of love still between Ministers and people; it will be hard to prove that a maintenance determined breaks love; no though by the Laws of man, but of that hereafter; and as hard to prove that the maintenance undetermined would remedy all: by no means, for will not the charging them with their duty in general, that the Minister have a portion under the penalty of damnation, telling them else they have not that Faith that works by love; and that their Faith will not avails to Salvation; and this continually urged upon them, till they repent, anger them that love their money too well, as well as if we Preached, yea sued for any maintenance determinately? Let this present maintenance be taken away, and people left

to

And indeed that we may close this third Proposition by confronting it with reason, even for a special particular determination, and not only a general one opposite to the mind and heart of the giver: it seems hard to be believed that ever God should now at last leave his Ministers to the unconscionable consciences of men, who had never done it before: Are Gospel-Ministers the only persons likely to be neglected by God? or is the grace of the Gospel become so universal, as that a Law is now unnecessary? why not in other things as well? yet why not rather in any thing then in matters of money? or Gospel-grace is not given to take away Laws, but to enable men to keep them: It were a better inference from the greater grace to conclude greater strictness of Lawes then greater looseness, as many doe, especially Ancients; yet amiss that too, but this far worse.

Gal. 6. 6.

However this greater grace is not received by everyone; and tis every one, that is taught, to communicate: God sends Ministers to multitudes, that professe the Gospel in their mouths, but deny it in their lives; who, the more holy the Ministers; will hate him the more; and the more convincingly he Preaches, will the more gnash upon him with their teeth, and be ready to run upon him as they did upon Stephen; and if any severity of Discipline be exercised upon them, will be ready to rear him aloft with their teeth; and is it reasonable to think Gods Ministers live to the free-wills of these to communicate what they please, according to the mind and heart of the giver? or are such men fit Judges of their own abilities to give, and of a Ministers need and worth? For my part, I had rather trust a wicked Magistrate with this, then a wicked people; he would not be Judge in his own cause, and might have some sense of honour guiding him to a righteous decision: yet Christ had left us to such a people, and I doubt not Judge Christ faithlesse and ignorant (O what conclusions might be for a silly world to draw from any supposition, though heyer so impossible!) but I should say his wayes were (though wise) yet most unsearchable and past my finding out.

P. 11.

But a Minister shall have better entertainment from the godly, yes and sometimes from the wicked also: yet why should Christ lay a snare in godly peoples way? no: If he returne to us according to a mans mind and heart, a small matter it is to make that rule; if we were not so wilfully, but allow as much as to this conclusion I plead for; yet who sees not an hundred shifts for so strickt a sin as covetousness is to elude bounds but generally defined? And are not Gods people liable for covetousness as well as other men? I love not to touchable stories; yet the second conclusion may be instance enough well considered.

And Broadish people, willing to their power; and beyond their power.

ers, and in great tenderness of spirit should enquire what particularly must come out of their pusses; where might a scrupulous conscience find that in which it may rest satisfied, as having done its duty? How hard is it for a man truly to know what is to his power! What the mere necessity of a Minister is in general, what of this Minister in particular? (We are most of us over-modest, or overquerulous) we can far easier tell the poor mans necessity, which is a debt only of charity, than the Ministers, which is, a debt of the strictest justice that can be between man and man, and so had need be more severely wounded, than then, the other; and if conscience will be at a loss in judging of the necessity, how much more in the honour, and the double honour? Doubtless, if God hath not determined this thing, and Magistrates may not, these two evils will follow: It will be the way to bring Ministers to the mercy of hard stony consciences, who have no sense of duty, gratitude, honour, or any thing, so they may but keep their money: And it will be the only way to bring tender consciences to the mercy of Ministers, as the only sure way to remove scruples. Take as the soul desires it, it is not so easie to find any other growth that will by firm, and not sink under him, without breaking himself to Gods pattern of old, either as a rule, or as an obliging example.

1 Sam. 2. 16.

The very like scruples would have arose, if the proportion of our time due to God had not been by himself, determined, and if Gospel-freedom, and the abundance of grace in it, had not left one uncertain, why the other? Fallen Nature is more plentifully instructed about generals; and the more is drawn to individuals, the more is it at a losse; and yet hither Nature bends, and without it rests not; for action is not of generals, it needs therefore some superiour direction: Now to a man that views things onely with the judgement of reason, it would seem very strange, that God should expressly determine in Scripture A time, and a maintenance, in which nature can determine for itself what its duty is without any new direction; and yet say nothing of How much time, and How much maintenance, the thing Nature is at a losse, and needs help in. Therefore our relief he should determine that which is least subject to doubt, and leave that undetermined which is most. And what cause can any reason give why time should be particularly determined, which will not call for the like in maintenance? Gods will indeed would carry it, but that is in question, and I am now led by example, from the reason, to the end of the will; or rather supposing the will as proved above, and yet to be proved to give the reason why, of how much time, and how much maintenance.

It is the safety of a willing Christian to have his way plainly chalked out to him in all things, not to live and obey God at random, never yet knowing what Christian that was willing to do his duty, but he
and w was

was desirous to know distinctly and particularly what his duty was (as on the other side I have known men that have been willing to shut off duty, love an uncermain'd doubtful determination of their duty.) And it may seem strange that God should usually deprive this desire, which is of his own Spirit's putting into them, of all possibility of satisfaction in this point, especially when in no one thing God hath done the like. The most likely instance is Alms to the poor; but the case is not like, the measure of charity being necessity, and therefore possible to come under a certain rate (as we see daily by experience) in general, but increase when it comes to the individual, the poor person thus to be relieved. Here therefore the fit proportion cannot, need not be determined: Besides, it would do much to the overthrowing the very nature of charity, this determination; but Justice admits, which of the two requires set bounds. And this Justice is, capable of them, because it hath for its measure honour, which going beyond necessity, included charity, and all its ordinary varieties within it, and is not moved up and down with them, which honour having a respect to the excellency of the Evangelical service, and that Excellency being a standing Excellence, it follows that the Honour is capable of a standing measure, which the poor want best is not. And if the tender conscience wishes it so, and the nature of the thing proclaims it is ay be so, and the evidence of fact shew it hath been so, sober reason may require a cause why it should not be so still; and finding none, may suppose it is so.

Especially considering you further, I hat whatever special commendations may be of the Free-will Offering, that is not at all excluded; though maintenance be defined thus, men are left a liberty to goe beyond it. The like here, as in matter of time, Christians may redeem much (and ought) before the search commoged proportion.

So then we may have a stated proportion, and so have the advantages one way; and yet be as liberal as reason and good by you, as occasions, and Christian prudence shall direct; and so not lose whatever convenience may be imagin'd the other way. And this here, seeing it pleases you Neighbour, sons, Chise to hang upon this flying, would be reason's resolution in this thing, if I know what reason is.

Hitherto general bounds and no more; yet such as for ever exclude mans free-will from fixing its own bounds in this duty. For stand we here, and were no further, all that could be concluded on that way would be but this much, That God had left the resolution of particulars under those general of the Father's of men; whatever reason's resolution in particular that answers this general is God's rule; and the world of difference will be to specify what

what that is, and of conscience to certain obedience, and of the will to do it: Here is a latitude of mans judgment and discretion needed (but no excuse in that judgment, being bound to resolve with an under pain of Gods high displeasure: If God say, Let the Elders have double honour; Discretion must not say, This is double honour, when it is not; but what is so indeed, it must determine; and it were better to have been defined to our hands; which paides would be saved by it, and the possibility of Error prevented) But to the Will there is no latitude at all, whether in the measure were by God himself defined in particular: God says, Honour; Discretion says, This is honour: shall the Will contradict; only so far as Discretion is entrusted; the Will hath this miserie, it follows a blinde guide in stead of a seeing one, that is like enough to lead it self and it into the pit.

But we what there is further to be found out towards a particular determination; I add therefore a fourth Conclusion.

That there is no countenance given in all the Gospel to a proportion less than a Tenth. We finde no command of any under a Tenth; and no reasonable reason will take it lower, either comparing our Ministry with theirs under the Law; so judging upon the account of Excellency; or comparing our Country, or at least any, with Canaan (with due respect this to the never dying memory of that famous man of God Mr. Perkins) for where the Crops are more plentiful, prices commonly are anwerably low; where less plentiful, higher; which will reduce such differences of Lands to an equality; so judging upon the account of necessity; no equity of taking things lower either way. Neither is there any certain example of less given by any; and there are certain examples many of more given; the Apostles left all; and Christ commanded the young man to sell all, and many to sell what they had, give, and follow. The first Jewish Believers did so; and the withholding but of a part, when it was devoted whole, left *Anania* and *Sapphira* their lives; and we have cause enough to fear their souls too. Pauls Canon for the Churches (I though extraordinary) contribution was the whole increase of their stock; the *Philippians* went beyond their power, even beyond the Apostles Canon, else no need of their paying him with much earnest care to receive the gift; and the state of those times did necessarily require it, when the poor were mostly wrought upon by the preaching of the Word: That man that gave so little to the service of the Church as a Tenth in those times, was not like to be a faithful steward of what God had given him. Though I suppose the Apostles made use of much less when they had it for their own subsistence; and so (I hope) do many of us, where necessarily provisions do not stretch our hands from making any thing.

gnggung

5. That

2 Cor. 3. 6.

Mat. 10. 21.

Luc. 12. 33.

Ab. 5. 5, 10.

1 Cor. 16. 2.

2 Cor. 8. 3, 4.

Jam. 3. 5, 7.

5. That in case a Tenth reach not Gods general measure defined, then an higher measure is a duty. If you ask how far this higher measure must reach? even thus far. That they bring not this evil certainly visibly upon themselves, which by their contribution they are to remove from their Minister: For example, That we doe not destroy our own lives to preserve his; that we leave not our own to certain Almies to prevent his leaving his so, &c. yea more, it will seem agreeable to Christian duty for men to deny themselves in many conveniences of life, and binde themselves up into a straiter compasse then simply were fit, that all hinderances being removed out of the way, the Word of the Lord may not be bound, but may run, and be glorified; it being of far more importance to the Gospel, that such a one be not hindred in the course of his motion, then that any private man, at least, should not. And this is no strange resolution as to the Ministers measure, when the very same resolution we have as to the poor mans measure, the losse of his life through want of necessaries being to be prevented by any thing short of the losse of our own and ours: Here therefore much more, so far as the Ministers measure goes, it being far more necessary, that Gods truth and worship be upheld in the world, far more beneficial to our selves and families to be instructed to salvation, for Gods eternal and temporal blessings both to be bestowed on us and them, then that we leave great estates to our children, to be a sin to us, in withholding sacrilegiously where it is due, and a snare to them soul and body as goods so derived commonly prove to be! In case therefore of need how dare we give so little as a Tenth, when all examples of New Testament Saints lead us higher? when God hath commanded the double honour, but no where commanded that we should enjoy the nine parts entire and whole to our selves.

And who will chide if I turn aside to weep over the degeneracy of them that call themselves Christians? How many riotous prodigals can finde vast summes for Gaming, Races, Cock-fightings, gilt Watches, great Buildings, and multitudes of Followers, &c. when nothing can be found by them for the Ministers of Christ, more worth then thousands of such empty Kickshaws, though perhaps ready to perish for want? One suit of apparel made for one of our gaudy gallants might clothe many a Ministers family as well as mother, and one of their riotous feasts might feed such a family as other twelve months. Yea when the portion of many wealthy Citizens children shall be enough to provide honestly for twenty Ministers children, yet this man will grudge to give twenty shillings beyond the custom to supply his Ministers present need: Alas, he hath children of his own to provide for. Are these men Christians? are they not men that take earth for heaven? Wretched world! In such a grudging

certain, you shall give me what you please: but so far as precepts are made so far up the tree will offering, the third conclusion undertook them; so far as precepts are made for the change of a tenth into any thing else, it is this conclusion take to answer them. And here we are brav'd with an high challenge: Who dare affirm that the Law of Tithe is not chang'd? *Hebr. 7. 12.* Well if it be that Scripture which supports this wonderful confidence, that challenges thus the whole world, we shall follow you from the 5. 2. where you but proclaim your challenge to the 14. 2. 15. where you endeavour to make it good. There I find you buckle co't with all your might, and to stirre up our dull sluggish incapacity we are thrice called upon, heed it well, mind it well, observe it well: in obedience to direction we are very attentive; what shall we hear now? *LaA*
 1. It is the scope of the Spirit, to prove that as certain as Christ is come in the flesh, so certain is he a Priest, an High Priest, and so certain he changed the Priesthood: true all this, the change of the Priesthood and Law ceremonial is the Spirit's scope, we heed it well.
 2. He bindeth it up with an *also*: we see the word *also* a Law is changed as well as the Priesthood, and because the Priesthood, therefore the Law; but that this is a part of this was Tithe's (though you stoutly tell us so). We cannot see, neither in words nor sense, though we look over these again, and find it a word and sense over.
 3. O to move both in effect and word, and so we shall be able to say: *111.* But another life is it, and another Heed it well: he doth not say, *it is*, but it is changed: just so you are in the very right, and the change of the Priesthood proves the change of the Law: very true; you have told us some already; and the Apostle told us so before you did express words; but Tithe was not so. O might I hear you still with this Scripture have so confidently challenge the whole world, know very well that I requested you to prove for me, that *the Law* which is said to be changed, was the Law of Tithe; why have you not done it? to the whole body of the ceremonial Law to give a part of Levitic's service pitching was in Tithe; the Jews and Gentiles were so zealous to maintain it, that we see many other things, and find upon almost any hand, that the Apostle employed in writing against Tithe, call the *Levitical* Law, the change of this Law, *whereas* it is, in that *ground* (I say) and yet so strangely to show besides the Mark in the *Epistle* that *Tithe* should be found in all his *Epistle*, to discover such a meaning; and to show us we do not witness the *Epistle* in any manner, as to the *Levitical* Law, from which Tithe is so strongly, I often think that *Levitical* Law of Tithe is not changed, but only a *Levitical* Law demonstration against *Levitical* Law, which Tithe is in *Levitical* Law, and have made this good by *Levitical* Arguments, that could

could not with a good conscience be justified. But behold, as
 so many solemn callings upon to mind it well, here's nothing
 but the Law is changed; therefore the Law of Tithes; as if there
 were no other Law could be changed but that; as sure as Christ is
 come in the Flesh, so I hear men speak most confident then, when
 they can prove least: For so saith the word, Verse 12. Nay do not
 so impudently belye Scripture; the word saith not so, and that
 it meanes so, you do not prove.

2. Come we now to the next Scripture; 1 Cor. 9. 14. What have
 we there? a likeness of maintenance, one would think at the first
 sight; but heed it well, and we shall find the quite contrary; will
 look upon it through the Glasse of your exposition: here we find
 the things of the Temple and Altar expounded by Tithes; the li-
 ving of the Gospel by *Freely you have received, freely give*; and the
 even so expounded by not so; it was then under the Temple I am
 sure by a Law; now without one; then something it was, and
 that something a determinate something; now nothing (such was
 the *freely* as it hath been proved, or something indeterminate, what
 men please, which is e'en as good as nothing. But not to pursue these
 wild conceits, for what glory is it to name them is to confute them:
 this I should resolve, concerning this Scripture, as impartially as
 I am able; that whereas there were two sorts of Provisions, under
 the Law for the Ministers of Gods holy things; one out of donee
 Ceremonial; as the Priests share in the Sacrifices of the Altar; the
 other question'd whether it be ceremonial or no; the Levites
 Tithes; *Paul* by the even so constitutes a like to the former (as oblati-
 ons at the Lords Table) not the very same; not because the even so of
 it self will not require it, but because the nature of the things spoken
 of, will not bear it; but for the other provision doubted of, whether
 ceremonial or no, before we know how to interpret the even so, we
 must resolve that doubt, if it appear ceremonial as the rest, then the
 even so is to be interpreted by a like provision; if there appear nothing
 ceremonial in it, then the even so is to be interpreted by the very
 same; there being no reason here that the words should be strained
 at all, so on both sides this Scripture will be yielded upon a suppo-
 sition; suppose we it is proved by them, that Tithes are a proper part
 of the Ceremonial Law; I shall yield this Scripture, and *Heb. 7.*
12. to them; and the whole cause: on the other side let them sup-
 pose Tithes never to have been a part of that Law; and this duly
 proved by us (which I have endeavour'd to do) they will have
 little cause to stand with us about this Scripture, or indeed about
 the whole cause.

3. Christ and the Apostles nowhere have commanded Tithes to be
 given. *Ans.* We are now inquiring after the change of the old
 command, and the now new command will not conclude that; but

Matth. 5. 17.

upon a very wicked principle, that whatever *Old Testament Law* is not particularly commanded in the *New Testament*, is void and of no force: a general confirmation we have, and all Gods Laws stand till himself repeal them; but of the *New Testament* command about Tithes more anon.

4. Neither Christ nor his Apostles ever took Tithes, yea they used another way themselves. Impossible this to be proved, yea as certain as Christians at first paid more then a tenth, which is most certain, so certain is it that they paid a tenth, and what becomes of this reason already? but allow it is true: it pretends to; what's the conclusion thence? Christ demanded not a tenth, therefore he renounced it; the Apostles made not use of their right, therefore they had none consequent; who sees nor it is so? yet to leave no appearance of shelter to them from this their last refuge, see we all distinctly.

2 Cor. 8. 9.

Luc. 8. 2.

Christ took no Tithes, be it so: he came to be poor, therefore to be Ministred unto; he had a right to the Kingdom as the Son of David, yet he took it not: to Tithes also as a Priest, yea in his own person he took them not; humiliation was his present business.

P. 2.

5. But in his Ministers he then took them; the *Levitical Priesthood* standing till the Crucifixion of Christ; so what was paid to Levi the Figure was paid to Christ, as it is truly said, what was given to *Moses* indeed the figure was given to Christ.

The Apostles Example is considerable, either in Christs time or after it. In Christs time be it that they took no Tithes, they were flattered by Gods own assignment to another Priesthood yet in being.

2. The State of Christ was such as to be poor in his followers as well as in his own person.

3. If Christ took them not, how could they have them?

Act. 10. 38.

Matth. 11. 5.

4. The State of Christ and of his Apostles was a State of *Peripatation*; ever in motion; he went about doing good; and that was not a State of gathering and laying up of Tithes in kind.

5. The poor were mostly wrought upon by the Preaching of the Gospel, who many of them had no Tithes to pay, the rest that had none to spare, having paid one Tenth already.

Luc. 10. 1, 19.

6. There was no need; Ministers being then few, twelve standing ones, and seventy temporary ones, as appears by their commission, and their giving up their account upon returning; for them there was enough Ministred, till an overplus for the Poor, besides what help Christ brought in at several times by miracles; and who will say Tithes nor paid, and more in the view, that houses what the Apostles did, what *Zachary* did, what Christ commanded the young man, others? it is enough to give a reason, why Tithes in kind were not taken by the Apostles in Christs time without any purpose of repealing them.

Jo. 13. 29.

Luc. 19. 13, 33.

See

But then what farther may be said of the Apostles practice after Christ's time, and that first among the *Jews*; be it that then they took no Tithes. The Levitical Priesthood then received them, who as they remained still by sufferance to an honourable Ministry, so they took Tithes by the same sufferance. MA. 21. 20.

It would have been exceeding scandalous to believing *Jews*, who were all Zealous of the Law, to have the Ministry of it removed out of the way, and Tithes taken from them.

The Apostles themselves kept the Law, so making use of the Ministry of it must pay their Tithes to that Ministry, if they had any. MA. 2. 24.

They were then so poor that they were constrained to sell, and lay the price at the Apostles feet, for the Saints present supply, and more then once needed they large contributions from the Gentile Churches.

As for the Gentiles themselves they had other burdens: Heretick Idol Priests, at least in many places, took away their tithes, and though we find not their whole Estates separated for the service of the Gospel, as for a time it was among the *Jews*; yet it is beyond doubts they paid tithes and more; the number of Believers being for the greatest part of the poorer sort, and they often sending relief to the Saints at Jerusalem, and doing it to their power, and beyond their power: if this was not done in kind, neither is it for much as in many places, only with this difference, then they paid much more in money, then if they had paid the tenth in kind; now they pay much less; yet what is this to the change of the way? There is a special reason for it, they were then in a moving condition through manifold persecutions; and though the Apostles in planting of Churches, and ordaining of Elders in every City did endeavour to bring them to a settled fixed State; yet the rage of the Dragon gave them little rest; first by the angry *Jewish* little Dogs; then by the fiercer *Heathen* Masters, worrying them out of their goods; and last of all, Cruel edicts doing them much mischief; and the Licentious Plundering Soldiers much more. In such extremities there was no time of orderly Gathering, and laying up Tithes in kind; what they had was for the service of the Church; no man looked for more then from hand to mouth, all preparing for present Martyrdom; yet even then, as there was any breathing, some instances are of payments in kind, even of Tithes; though I suppose not in the bulk, but by Piece-meals, as the necessity of those times required; nothing then is to be drawn from these instances to prove Gods relinquishing his right to Tithes; they paying more then a Tenth in value, rather than being abundantly given, why they did not pay a tenth in kind.

What the great *Lad. Capel.* adds out of *Matth. 23. 23.* from Christ's opposing *Tiribing Mint, and Anise, and Cummine* to the weightier matters of the Law, which would not be if the Law were Moral,

is of small moment; the opposition being not between the weightier matters and Tithes simply (would the Learned Man say that to pay Tithes simply under the Law, was not a weighty thing?) but between the weightier things and Tithes of mint, &c. so on the other side Christs ought here, is insufficiently alledged for the morality of them, because at this time all three Laws were standing; so this Scripture may be let alone on both sides.

P. 2.
Hebr. 7. 8.

2 Cor. 5. 20.

Adde we now for a close, for all that Tithes are Christs Portion given, saith my Neighbour: but I say, paid by Abraham to Melchizedek, and to him to Christ. Levi a Tith-taker that dies; Christ a Tith-taker that lives; and so is Eternally due as long as such things are to be paid on Earth: if Christ be not a perpetual taker of Tithes, the Opposition is of no advantage on Christs side, but Levi had it; for he was a Tith-taker many ages of Generations together; how then shall Christ take this due, being now in Heaven, but by these that are in his stead on Earth? so he ever received Tithes, even when he was in Earth, and much more so now he is in Heaven. This, and 1 Cor. 9. 14. upon the supposition that Tithes are no part of the Ceremonial Law, have we as positive evidence that the particular determination of a tenth is still in force, besides all that hath been said to answer the pretences for a repeal.

And what's the issue of all? are Tithes still of Divine right and to be resolved so by the force of these reasons? I humbly submit them and my self to the censure of them that are able to judge, and will do it as becomes Christians without bitterness & disdain. As for you, my good Friend, & truly loved Neighbour, however I am dealt with by you, I only say thus much, do not scorn the question of the Divine right, till you have distinctly and plainly answered, what is here pleaded for it: I shall readily and thankfully receive any light may be given me by them that can see further than my self, even by you or any, communicated by word or writing: but mere words, and confident assertions will not do it, much less bitterness, and wrath, and clamours, and evil speaking. I may without arrogance affirm that nothing but plain Scripture demonstration must carry it against the reasons given; and such I hope I shall freely acquiesce in; there will be no need of reviling terms, as long as I am ready to lay down my argument, and my Tithes with it, as soon as it is proved to be a Levitical Ceremony, and so a sin to take it, and not only nakedly affirmed; one clear Scripture ground will go further with me than a thousand empty affirmations; wasps without stings make an angry noise to fright Children, but they hurt them not.

The

(49)

The Ministers second Plea for his Portion.

The Magistrates Power and Duty in making Laws for the Church.

I Am now to begin a new Webbe, but that which I hope we shall see come about sooner, the power and duty of Magistrates to see Gods Laws for the maintenance of his Ministers put in execution. A question wherein Magistrates have many Adversaries: but it is a great cause of grief to see some Magistrates their own Adversaries. The grand Adversary here is the Papist, whose usual reproach it is that our belief follows the State, and that our Religion is Parliamentary; but we can bear with such reproaches; it is more comfortable to see a Papist rattle against the truth then trample over it, but that within those walls there should be found so many that think Religion an unfit thing to determine of, is a thing greatly to be lamented. May Papists for ever bear the name of a Parliament, under what cunning disguise soever they dresse themselves, and may Parliaments never turn their faces into despising, by making themselves Vill in their eyes; what are Magistrates like under Christ in the New Testament then they were in the Old? Does not reason tell us that the scope of Politick Societies is not merely to live, but to live well? And is there any living well without the Soul be provided for? Hath God declared and done so much against the idolatry of the people of Israel; and do we not yet think, that the care of Gods Worship is of main concernment to the temporal welfare of a people? Do such Magistrates think themselves keepers of swine, whose care is only that they have Meat and Drink, that they gore not one another, and be not a prey to them that invade them? Have not we Soulds to provide a well-being for as well as bodies? What a torture and plague would it be for a man of a Spirit Zealous for Christ to be a Magistrate, if he must have great power put into his hands enabling him to do much, and yet withal his hands bound that he shall do nothing? I had rather be a Door-keeper in the House of God in the meanest Office wherein, as such, I may A& for Christ, then in the highest Office of State wherein, as such, I may do nothing for Christ.

But leaving expostulations, however most just, let's see upon what principles this power and duty stands.

To begin with the beginning, we find Adam a King and a Priest; Melchizedek, a King and a Priest; the Priesthood annexed to the

Hebr. 12. 16.

Gen. 18. 19.

Matth. 19. 8.

Lev. 10. 34.
12. 16.

Princes, which made him a proper person in selling his high Right : Legal and Sacerdotal power went together for many ages of the world : All that while their Constitutions for the well ordering of Worship had the force of binding Laws ; if there were any such Constitutions, as such there must be, God then propagating his revealed truths through their hands by tradition, not as now by Scripture. I know him that he will Command, belongs to Abraham, Principally and Potentially power, both in delivering down the Ordinances of Gods Worship as Laws to his Children and Servants. And sure God did not joyn those two Offices in one person, but that the Authority of the Prince might winne more awe from the then rude world, then if meaner persons were employed in the Priestly Office. Hitherto the whole power about holy things was in the Princes hand, and thus from the beginning ; a good Argument that with such Alterations as God was pleased to make at several times, it is to continue to the end ; the Magistrate hath power in Gods holy things, from the beginning it was so. Not but that the Offices were distinct, though the person was the same, and the Acts several, and each deriving its functions immediately from God, but being in one they joyned hands, and mutually strengthened each other by their several Interests ; the Prince the Priest, by all Actions of a Prince ; the Priest the Prince by all Actions of a Priest ; so it should be now they are in several hands, and there is need both ways, we need not inquire which way most, though it be easy to guess. So it was then, and it is most unnatural to think it otherwise ; every Authority will do it, unless so it serve itself.

So they run in one Stream till they came to Moses ; then they divide ; and what is parted with at that division ? So much will be removed to other shoulders, the rest abiding where it was ; the time, and manner of doing this is found, Lev. 9. where we find Moses the Magistrate exorcising the whole Priestly Office in the Consecration of Aaron and his Sons, which Act was done by him as a Magistrate as well as a Prophet ; for then the Magistrate devell'd himself of that power, which had rested upon him from the beginning of the world till now, and communicating to another Order, the Government as to both duties, growing now too heavy to rest in one hand, through the multitude of those that were governed, and the variety of Laws they were governed by ; and what is now parted with ? The exercise of the Priests function in all the duties of that place ; the intrinsecal power of that holy ministration, but no more : the extrinsecal power of ordering both the people and his Sons in matter of Worship, commanding all to do their respective duties, tithing, encouraging, &c. This Moses parted not with, but exercised often afterwards, as the Story represents it to us, even quickly after the Consecration, though he never offered up Sacrifices with his own hands more ; if

any

any farther after attempts of *Moses* were merely Prophetical; and that the Princely power did not at all put forth itself in them; he will say to grace and without proof; it appears no more was devolved, the rest then was retained; and when we see it put forth, why should we doubt whither to referre it? *Moses* Prophetical Spirit was not necessary to direct about what God had already revealed, but about what was further to be received from God: But this was a power anciently communicated, long used; yea in new instructions from God the receiving and communicating them were Actions of the Office Prophetical: but the binding people to the observance of them by a legal establishment, is the Action of the Office Princely, and its legislative power had by *Moses* indeed after a manner extraordinary, but belonging to that power, however Lawfully had and held of God. And this difference is altogether the same in the Laws against Murder and Adultery; *Moses* otherwise forbid them as a Prophet, otherwise as a Prince; and although my Neighbour unadvisedly limit civil Laws to things indifferent, yet I hope this upon second thoughts will not be stood upon.

And this reserved power of *Moses* does yet further appear a certain and perpetual branch of his Princely Government, in that all succeeding Magistrates after him, Judges and Kings had it and used it; both those that were Prophetically inspired, and those that were not: the good ones to establish good things for the House of the Lord; the evil ones to neglect Gods House, and draw people to Idolatry; the Priests never meddling with this matter; none but *Jehoiada* appearing upon this Stage; and he in a time of great distress, as by right of his wife next of kindred to the crown, the seed Royal being all destroyed in the Kings Minority; as *Guardian*, Tutor and Protector to the King in his Infant State; yet even he for all his age, Authority, doing good in *Israel* both towards God and his House; yet, and towards the House of the King too; yet the King grown up, is under command even about the affairs of the Temple he was High Priest in; such matters put into his hands, is called to account, reproved, and business otherwise ordered, consents to all that's done without any contradiction, as in a thing belonging not to his office, but to the Kings. If this had been an encroachment, no person so fit as *Jehoiada*; no season so opportune as under a young King to him obliged for his life and Crown, to attempt the recovery of this power, and restore it to its proper place; he that had Authority and courage enough to keep in the Spirits of King, Princes, and People, so strongly addicted to Idolatry all his dayes, would not have likely failed in a manner business, that had belonged to his trust. But this not the work of one King or two, but of every one that was good, no way disallowed is done by God but extoll'd; and the best Men, men having this constant Character, that they did that which was good

F. 11.

2 Kin. 11. 17, 18.

2 Chro. 23. 18.

2 Kin. 24. 15, 16.

2 Kin. 12. 4, 7, 8.

2 Chro. 24. 17,

18.

2 Kin. 12. 2.

good

2 Chro. 26. 17,
18.

Verse 19.
Verse 21, 23.

2 Kin. 13. 2.

If. 44. 28.

P. 5.

good in the sight of the Lord. And whereas there was but one of them that presumed to execute the Priests Office, the Priests valiantly resisted him here, they knew what was within the Kings Commission, and when not seldom do men, a whole rank & Society of men, Generation after Generation, want courage to lay claim to, and vindicate their just powers: yea, and God himself presently testifies his dislike of this attempt, by smiting the Intruder with a Leprosy while he had a Censer in his hand, and was wroth with the Priests; and this never cured upon him to the day of his death; though a good King repenting doubtless, and pardoned, and many prayers offered up for him by all the Faithful: God would make him a standing example to after Princes, that they should not stretch beyond their commission in matters of Religion. Now if what was done, and that so generally, were an usurpation as well as this, likely God would have been jealous here too, and not have suffered himself to be perpetually noted in matters he is so exceeding tender of; yet this never done, they not once blamed, but always commended, and the Neglecters ever branded with a Note of Infamy for their neglect; yea the thing so pleasing to God, that he delights to speak of the doing of so acceptable a thing, and will make mention of the name of that blessed Instrument he intends to make use of for this purpose, above three hundred years before he was born; yea, and an Heathen *Cyrus* shall be honoured with the like favour about two hundred years (compute the uttering of that Prophecy, and the beginning of the seventy years how you please) before he was born for this very thing, not only for saying to *Jerusalem*, *Thou shalt be built*: but for saying also to the Temple, *This Foundation shall be laid*; and God sure would never set so large a Character of honour so long before upon that Action, which is an unwarrantable exorbitancy from mens bounds of duty, could never have pleased him.

Nay in this very thing we treat of Ministers maintenance, till Hezekias's time, it seems there needed no Laws under the reign of good Kings, and the malice of bad ones afforded none, though like enough there needed then: but then what an expresse one do we find? 2 Chro. 31. 4. this before the captivity; after the captivity another, *Neb. 13. 10, 11, 12*. These I proposed to my Neighbour as appears to which he adds, *If. 49. 13*. a place never once by me mentioned to him; and this which I mentioned not he frames an answer to, such as it is: but to that I did indeed alledge he says nothing; if this be fair dealing Neighbour in your serious hours, for conscience to conferre with it self, do you judge, yet this must not serve your turn either, therefore show us that these had no such power, it was a meer usurpation; or show us plain evidence of Scripture, for the revoking of this power, or yield to the unanswerable conviction of truth, for you may not flyly carry away such a matter as this is, by saying nothing to it.

After

After Nehemiah's time the Priestly and Princes power was again, not as at first Princes becoming Priests, but Priests becoming Princes: so it was for a time before under the Government of Eli, and so it continued till the Romans, a third party, between Brethren coming in, swallowed up all; whatever Authority those times may afford, *1 Mark. 14.* it is wholly ours in this cause.

Plain Resolutions these; for such a power in Magistrates once had, how came they so considerable a Pearl in the Crown of Princes to drop out thence? a plain expresse revoking is not presented to, and consequences had need be very manifest in a matter of this weight: 'in case to dally with such kind of proofs, as he that found out a repeal for this power in *Man. 5. 38, 39.* and *Gen. 49. 10.* such manner of proofs men may alledge by the scores: but to do this soundly, clearly, and convincingly will be an hard thing. This is the usual plea that the power of Magistrates, in making Laws about Church matters, was typical, and to cease upon the coming of Christ. Typical and Ceremonial are two words, that help us at a dead lilt many a time when we have nothing else to say; but pray *Sir,* were *Cyrus* and *Alexander* types of Christ too. *Exa. 7. 27.* And how is it proved that all the Kings of *Judah* were Types of Christ? And if so in any respect, how appears it they were so as Law-makers in matters of the Church and if so, why not as much in matters of State? all power is given to Christ, and he is the head of all things to the Church: what else is killing Children with death but an execution of such a power? Spiritual weapons cut off after another manner; yet Typical must needs therefore be repealed? *Melchizedech's* benediction was Typical (most of any thing in his Ministry) yet I hope not repealed therefore. I have my Neighbours Testimony with me in this business; who pleading for free will-offerings, finds them out in the old Law, and adds, *This was Typical*: Therefore I suppose to continue under the Gospel because Typical, if nothing else hinder; not therefore to be abrogated; that Type of Christ, whose fulfilling was mystical, see that be abrogated by Christ; but that Type whose fulfilling was literal, may, and I suppose must abide still. Be it then Typical yet as Christ blessed *Abraham* the Father of Believers by *Melchizedech* his Type; and now blesses Believers the Children of Faithful *Abraham* by Ministers, who are in his stead; so Christ may provide for the Church by Magistrates his Types under the Law; so now may he do the same by Magistrates, who in the Acts of their office are in Christ's stead too. I ask now, whether the meer consideration of a Type can overthrow this? In fine therefore whatever things are contained in this shift are uncertain, vain, empty all; and grant as much in courtesy as they can ask, yet then unconcluding too.

I shall now see what may be said for the affirmative that this power be duly still continues in Magistrates hands, now under Gospel times.

Math. 28. 18.

Eph. 1. 22.

Rev. 2. 23.

P. 17.

Matth. 5. 17.

1 Tim. 1.

17. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.

(63)
I think it will now be evident that the moral Law is of more power & credit, as a rule of duty, than the civil Law is, as a rule of government, which resolves this power to be in the magistrate: The Law which in the Stranger is Commanded to keep the Sabbath-day, and the Law which engages him to this but the civil Magistrate? every Stranger within their Gates, was not a Proselyte to be kept in by the Authority of the word. Nehemiah's Example is a good exposition upon the Law in this thing.

Eph. 6. 4.

1. In the fifth Commandment, none doubts but the Magistrate is concerned, and that what a private Father hath to do in his Family, that the publick Father hath to do in the Common-wealth, so much at least, and more, and that man is a bad Father, who thinks himself not engaged to Command his Children in first Table duties as well as in second Table ones; they are not worthy to be called the Children of Abraham, and have not learnt what the Apostles nurture and admonition mean; why not the same in second Table duties? The heart must be changed before an acceptable obedience can be yielded to these; and paternal Laws can as little change the heart as one as in the other: Instrumental causes must not be laid aside, because they can do nothing without the concurrence and guidance of the principal.

Heb. 6. 10.

Ps. 2. 1. 1. 1. 1.

P. 6.

2. Our regard I hope will be had of Old Testament Prophecies, that describe the state of the New Testament to us; among many others take we that for instance, that which of your own Neighbors you set up to frame an answer to, as supposing your self best able to deal with. Ps. 135. 13. They shall bow down, that is, they shall submit: no Christ: well; but what is the nursing Fathers & nursing Mothers? They shall bring them in the Arms of love; let that be it; a man would look up and find good Law in a Kings Arms: wholesome Ordinances well & duly executed, making it a dangerous thing to offend or wrong one of Christs little ones. You add not scourge them with the rod of power; what is no case, though they offend and deserve it? You have many such Absurdical expressions, I hope they dropped from you unadvisedly: Christians are for the Magistrates armes, his love, care, protection, defence; from his person, State, Laws, Forces, every thing he hath: he is not to count any thing too dear for them, not his life: but he hath a Rod to chastise their wantonness, yea, and a Sword to cut off their temporal life, if they so deserve it. They shall wait for the Lord, nor make the Lord wait for them: very pretty and Rhetorical! But where are the words that this interprets, it must be the last in that Verse, for they shall not be ashamed that wait for me. But this is not spoken of Magistrates, but of Christians who lay under heavy persecutions from Heathens, and waited for deliverance and exaltation from Christ; these have a promise not to wait in vain: Emperours that formerly sucked the blood of Christians, shall

now hold out the breast to them: did you not see that I would
 say so? Why do you make the words of the Lord to be as if
 they were? What say you now, expounders? That the Lord
 stand to the moving of the Lord in themselves, and that
 people be thus? But how? without the aid either of Ministry
 or Laws? or the Laws only excluded, but the Ministry admitted?
 It may be so, you say; but good Laws may have a little direction in
 their place, under the Lords moving, as well as good Ministers; then
 what is the not making the Lord wait for them? Is not hindering
 the Lords moving in themselves, and their people? Is not hindering
 the Lord make all men as well as Magistrates His servants, then hath no
 opposition to what is said by us and you; but with his out or not
 shoot besides the mark. You would needs, I suppose, they must
 wait for the Lords moving in their people; and not constrain them
 by Laws before the Lord make them willing; but this is quite contrary
 to making the Lord wait for them; for all the Ministry of
 the words; therefore it mistakes the sense of the place it occupies,
 and it is hard to find what design is in it, if not to mislead.
 But all this while, my very Eminent Neighbour, the Nurse is forgotten;
 the Nurses are not the only things make a Nurse; yet this is fair to
 wend our cause from your own expostion. Nurses and women to
 have breasts too, and they are indeed the essential of a Nurse; now let
 our Magistrates have Arms by whole sale, as we do not suffer inju-
 ries, and let them have breasts too by whole sale too; and provide
 sucklings for the Nurseries; we will think he play the Nurse well,
 and not otherwise; yes we will allow him a Rod, and a Sword too;
 for bad Christians, and for good ones also behaving themselves as the
 bad; though you dare not trust him with edged tools.
 Well, the Milk and the maintenance have a very near correspon-
 dence; we may think them the same; but may not this show from
 private devotion constraining themselves; not from public Laws con-
 straining others; otherwise then it is so good an Example may pro-
 voke them? not so; the private devotion of Princes may reach far;
 but this Nursery is too numerous to be provided for so; and such as
 the Nurses are, such are the breasts; a Prince both ways rules, when
 he rules by his Laws. Besides it is not comely to straiten a promise
 without manifest reason, promiscuous love to be understood in the largest
 sense they may; especially when we have the History of those Pro-
 phesies fulfilled, so largely interpreting them; as we have most am-
 ply, when the Roman Empire became Vassal to the Throne of Christ;
 the Nurse then was very lush of Milk in both Breasts, that of free
 Gift, and that of Laws too; and if promises be doubtful, let the His-
 tory expound them. So in other cases we are wont to say with good
 acceptance; how far it will be admitted here, I cannot tell.

The next of our evidences is from several confessions in the Gos-
 pels itself; they are

Matth. 28. 18.
 Prov. 8. 15, 16.

John 17. 2.
 Eph. 1. 22.

§ IV The Dominion of the whole world put into the hands of Christ, (Whom it follows) That all earthly powers are by him under him. By his Kings reign; and so are to rule for him their Subjects Sovereigns, as all inferior Officers are for the safety, honour, and welfare of the Superiours; and are bound as much to preserve the dignity of the power above them, as inferiours are bound to preserve their dignity. And as this power of Christ over all Galls, is with a special reference to the good of his Elect; so all officers under him are reasonably thought engaged to eye these peculiarly, and consider them in their loves and government, when their great Head and Sovereign particularly eye's and tenders, so far as they are able to know them from other men.

I durst not omit this Reason, because some friends in this cause are unsatisfied with it; though, did not the weight of the whole Conclusion lie much upon it; I should have forbore. Now 'tis enough to say that this principle hinders not our Assertion against the truth against whoever that defend the *Erastian* way, the Ministers of Christ having from Christ as immediately and solely the power of Censure, as they have the power of Preaching and Administering the Sacraments, as to which acts no man can ever prove the Magistrate Vice Christ: we may safely then allow him to be so as to act due and in his own Sphere. And as the principle is not to the hindrance of our Assertion for Church government; so neither is it to the furtherance of the *Erastian*, unless it were proved that this Vicegerency is in the acts of government controverted. Here that cause sticks, and I think will doe for ever; not in the Vicegerency simply and universally, even as to those acts of power, which between us and them, do undoubtedly belong to him.

Christ seems himself to acknowledge this power in the Magistrate standing before *Pilate*, *John 9.* and a power is here acknowledged, and that not to be understood by way of extraordinary permission, onely to accomplish Gods great counsel about mans Redemption; for that would have been no extenuation of *Pilates* sin beneath the deliverers, who had such a power as that as well as *Pilate*. Permission lessens no mans sin: It must therefore be another manner of power, from whence the greater sin may truly be concluded: And what can that be but the government being now since *Pompey* reduced them into a Province, well soled in the hands of the *Romans*, God constituting *Pilate* a lawful Judge in such matters as Christ was brought before him for; to which constitution of Gods, it became Christ, who was made under the Law, and to fulfil all righteousness, to submit himself according to that dispensation of humility he then went through, according as he did in other things, and particularly in his subjection to his Parents, there being the same reason of obedience to the publick Parent as there is to the private.

Mark 16. 19.
 & 18. 18.
 John 20. 23.
 1 Cor. 5. 12, 13.

Acts 2. 23.

Matth. 3. 15.
 Luke 2. 51.

V. 4.

[illegible]

But of all matters that come within the compass of his Dispute, the matter of Maintenance is least liable to contradiction, it being still the man that eats and drinks, nor the Minister's fault: And what belongs to a Magistrate is the judgment of these men, if it be this; to see that every Subject may live a Nay, in order to this very thing that they not take notice of, and allow of their way of living by which they rob? All governments, Heathen, as well as Jewish and Christian, have ever done this: If then Magistrates ought not to take cognizance of the matters of the Church, how can they allow for many thousand families under them to live without any calling allowed by them and their Lawes? Is it by meer connivence of Magistrates that we live? Why do they not compel us, as other idle persons, to labour with our hands? If men grant it lawful for Magistrates to vouchsafe us the allowance of Law, though not the establishment, that they may take this for a way of living just, honest, and useful for the Publick, even as the day-labourers, this will be enough to provide a provision for a just subsistence for one as well as for the other, if our way of life be such as may be allowed, they must see that we may live, and not perish in it. A very Heathen, tolerating the Christian Religion within his Dominions, may, and ought to tell Christian, If you will be of this Religion, and have Ministers wholly attending on this very thing, to me the

Now why should this Whore say to Kings, what have you to do with my Idols? Your Commission is but in civil things (hardly to them, neither a reference to Spirituals may hold them in too.) Have we such a Lash time; it is no wonder she knows they are the persons appointed by God, to make her dishonour and naked, and scour her flesh, and burn her with fire; could she persuade them to let her alone with her Adulterers, she were safe then: But for those who would be thought the only through enemies of the Whore in the world, all having some confederacy with her more or less; but they who hate her, and petition for things purposely, as they say, that the Whores Flesh may be eaten and the burnt with Fire; these men, if they mean as they speak, deserve to be wondered at indeed. O ye Rulers, pull down Tithes, that Antichristian yoke, and impose nothing upon mens consciences in the room of them; let every one Worship God in his own way, that so you may eat the Whores Flesh, and burn her with Fire; let her alone, that you may destroy her; touch her not, that you may make her naked; the most effectual means to ruin Antichrist this; they plot against us with all their wit and malice continually, and put their plot in execution unweariedly, sparing neither cost nor industry; and we are persuaded, the best course against them is to let them alone, and take their course; namely to give up our throats to be cut by them; and this not only a duty from us, but the most effectual means, to ruin them. I shall now with these mens Daughters may play the Harlots, that they may learn by an home experience whether, let them alone, be the only effectual means, to reclaim them. But such reasonings we must expect from men when they are appointed to destruction: *Quas Deum vult perdere dementat prius*: who so will destroy you himself is first to make you foolish.

Now my good Friend and Neighbour, what is it you have to lay in the Ballance against these many so strongly concluding reasons? one would expect nothing less than down right New Testament Laws against us, who shall read your peremptory conclusion. This is the period of all; the Gospel must be free, and kept free from mans power, for this is an Ordinance of God. An Angel of God let down from Heaven, charging mankind to fear God, and believe in Christ, could speak no otherwise; yea, and we are threatened too; who? every one, the *Protector*, if he find not out the old *Romish* Laws that have commanded Tithes, his sin will find him out; who else? the whole Nation; and Nations. It is no wonder that Gods Judgements do impend Nations, whose Princes and Teachers hinder this odour (the free will-offering). Marvellous confidence! especially if we add the magnificent conclusion, as if it were an old Oracle out of Christs own mouth; he that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

A man would think nothing less than the Denial of Christ came in the Flesh; even the expresse Denial were threatened thus in these words

P. 16.

P. 7.

More of this
Brain, P. 12.

dreadful words; but 'tis no more then this, That Princes may make no Laws to command the people, to give the Spiritual Labourer his wages; they must do it of their own accord, or the Labourer must have nothing, and be contented too; for they owe him no more then what they please to give him; if this be all, we are pretty well pacified, no great cause for such an out-cry: yet if the evidence produced of Gods mind in this thing be very plain and undeniable, that may do much, to bring us all into the danger of that dreadful and universal curse, as we shall answer the contrary at the day of judgment; We are pretty well used to bug-bear words, and have observed where men speak most weakly, they speak most confidently. I shall therefore take the boldness to examine your reasons, as I can pick them out of that confused heap where they lie.

P. 12.

Your reasons are either such as conclude against a command of God, or man in general, or such as conclude against a command of mans in particular: the Scriptures concluding generally, are *Pf. 110.3. Exod. 23. 5, 21, 22, 29. Phil. 4. 17, 18, 19. 2 Cor. 8. 1. 1 Chron. 28. 9. 2 Cor. 9. 7, 14, 18.* These have been answered distinctly and plainly above: P. 23, 24, 25. Thither I shall referre you; for those reasons that are particularly directed against the Magistrates power and duty, I shal answer them now.

1. It does dishonour Christ in his prerogative, whose royalty it is to prepare for his Ministers. *Matth. 28. 19, 20.* To prepare you mean food & subsistence for them, among many other things Christ prepares for his Ministers, that indeed is one; and we blese him for his Faithful preparing; he hath done according to his promise, by stirring up the hearts of Princes and people to contribute; and then by stirring up Magistrates, his Servants on earth, to establish and secure as Vigilant *Foefees*, what is so contributed to the use of the Gospel; and we believe it is Christs prerogative Royal, to chastise them that withhold from his Ministers the Meat which he hath thus prepared for them.

P. 3.

Will this serve your turn? No; it must be another exercise of prerogative, by which he is supposed to prepare for his Ministers, only by stirring up peoples hearts, without any establishment of mans; but does that Scripture prove such a thing? or any Scripture? or reason? or experience? or any thing? I have thought it the safest way to understand promises in the same sense, wherein we have seen them fulfilled; and we have found in all ages Ministers provided for, some this way, some another way; some in part this way, some in part another way; as the promise to *Paul* of the lives of all in the Ship with him was fulfilled, to some one way, to some another way, to all fulfilled; so here the promise is, I will be with you; and that includes comfortable provisions for life in their Ministry, but he does not tell them how, whether this way, or that, whether by Magistrates or without, whether by contributions *in diem* or for ever; whether ordinary or miraculous: any of these wayes, or the like, he is as good as his word.

A8. 27. 43, 44.

It should therefore be demonstrated, that Christ hath reserved this royalty to himself solely and only, and that he will have no Instruments to serve in it under him: but why is this matter of money so sacred a thing that none but Christ may touch? hath he not committed greater matters then this to Instruments under him? Surely the matter is lesse in the eye of Christ, then it is in the eye of man; *Atheistical* mā loves that the business of the purse should be heard only by the hearing of Christ; let him scape till then, he will venture that: but let it not be so with you my Neighbour; I would have you more afraid of the hearing of Christ alone then so, and not to count it a desirable priviledge, that your purse matters may be reserved to that dayes Tryal; pray does Christ work upon the hearts of people to regeneration mediately? and is the parting with a little money so choise a business, that it is alone he should work immediately? why? such a sole immediate preparation would exclude Church discipline, from meddling in this matter aswell as civil Laws; yea, and the Ministers Authority commanding it in his place aswell as the Magistrate in his; if those two wayes be admitted, then tis not altogether immediately, and it will rest to show how the interposing of Magistrates under, and for Christ, in the executions of his commands, does more entrench upon the Sovereign Royalty of Christ, then the enterposing of a Church or Minister: if any say, these do it by Christs Authority, Magistrates not so; this is to beg the question, and the meer Royalty of Christ here alledged, will not conclude it against us; we must see what is further said for that.

P. 2.

The Lord will have no service but what himself chooseth: Well, if this be a part of service, God may have chosen this; but be it that a Tenth is not determined by God, yet this reason fights equally against a determination, made by our own mind and heart, as by another mans: you suppose, I hope, that the Creatures will, be it whose it will be, ours, or another mans, makes will-Worship; did ye not consider this? we must both answer it, in case a Tenth be not of Divine right, nor any other portion determinately: I should answer it thus, that God hath made a portion due; if he have left the proportion undetermined, he will never charge men with sin, our selves or any others, for meddling with that, which he hath imposed a necessity for them to meddle with; yea, though it were nearer to the Worship of God then Ministers maintenance is; if you say that mans own will may determine this undetermined thing of God; but the Magistrates may not: still this is the question, and the meer consideration of will Worship will not conclude against the Magistrate; follow on then further.

That procuring Laws from the Magistrate for our maintenance, and using them (this is the utmost, I suppose, of what you would say, though you expresse it not) is not to trust Christ to provide for us,

said

said without proof, very easy disputing this : but though you think us bound to take your word, I shall not so impose upon you. I say therefore, we dare, we do trust Christ to provide for us, he hath done so, and we thankfully accept it, acknowledging it to his praise; and so long as he is pleased to continue this provision of his, we shall endeavour to use it in Faithfulness to his honour, and not count our lives dear unto our selves, that we may finish our course with joy; and if ever he shall alter this provision, or permit it to be altered, whether by setting up another in its room, or by setting up none in its room, doubt not but there will be found both Faithful Ministers, who will dare trust Christ still; and Faithful people whose Faith will work by love, in communicating out of al their goods unto him that teacheth, whatever remissness there be in the Laws of men, and whatever fained pretences there are of necessity, &c. to excuse from the duty, yet God is not mocked. P. 3.

In the mean time it is a principle of Religion, not to be unknown to a Teacher of others, that our trust in Christ for our necessary preservation must be in the use of honest means, that we may not tempt God; if God set Meat before us, we must not say when we need it, We will not eat it, for we will trust God. Indeed to leave the Lawful means of our preservation, and fly to unlawful means that we may secure our welfare, is indeed not to trust God, we look for a proof that it is thus in our present case, but we find it not here: Go on then.

Would you have Governours to do that which God never commanded them nor us to do? What the *Us* hath to do in this matter where the question is about civil Laws, I could not readily find out; I will suppose the best sense of it; I can imagine your meaning may be thus much, Would you have our Governours impose that which God never commanded them to impose, nor us to pay? Then this begges the question on both sides, of Gods command to us to pay; we have spoken in the first Sect of Gods command to the Magistrate, to see those Laws of his obeyed in this present. P. 4.

Ministers maintenance is holy; and Magistrates have power only in civil things: Suppose Ministers maintenance determined particularly by God, then it is holy as appointed by God, and as appointed to God both; yet even then would Magistrates have a power, though not to make any original Laws, to make them *de novo* due, which is done to their hands by the Law of God; yet to see Gods Law executed and obeyed, and to redresse the neglect of it: why not this as well now as under the Law? What reason drawn precisely from the Holiness of the maintenance to the contrary? Again, suppose Ministers maintenance not determined particularly, but only in general; then holy it is as generally determined, and as separated to God and his service, not to be alienated without Gods consent: but P. 4, 5.

the particular determination, whether by private devotion, or by publick Sanction, is not holy as such; only as it is the execution of a Law in general about maintenance, and as it now respects an holy use; both which were not in it before the consecration; else that would not be arbitrary; this then is civil, and therefore by force of this Argument belongs to the Magistrate; it not being holy till after the consecration, as in the case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira* sacrileg: it is plain. And I would know what reason there is from this Argument against a Magistrates determination, which may not be applied to a private Christians as well? the hands of a Christian Magistrate may be as fit to make a civil thing holy, as of an *Heathen* Magistrate, yea as of a private Christian; for what does Magistracy make men profane who were not so before? Show me a reason of this difference, why a private Christian by his own Voluntary determination may make a civil thing holy, when a Christian Magistrate may not; and rest within the bounds of this Argument if you can. If then the proportion determinate be not appointed by God; then before, and in its determination it is civil, after its determination alone it becomes holy; till then by your own reasoning 'tis fit for any hand, publick as well as private to meddle with.

But what if the principle on which this unconcluding reason is built, be unsound also? I shall now try the strength of what you bring for the proposition, That the Magistrates power is only in civil things; therefore it was but in civil things; therefore Notes an Argument; let's see now what it is. Because when *Peter* and *Paul* gave this command, there was not one Christian King upon Earth; they knew not Christ; therefore what? that the commanded obedience is only in civil things: why? civil and holy are termes contradistinct, not civil and Christian: It is knowable without Gospel light that there is a God; that this God is to be Worshipped; that some persons are to be employed in his Worship as Ministers of his holy things; that to these an honourable maintenance is due from those for whose sakes they Minister. *Heathen* Magistrates might be bound to take care of these things though Christ had never been Preached to them and these things are holy too; so your conclusion will never be drawn from your premises, were they never so faultlesse, unless you will say that the Magistrate hath nothing to do to see that the name of God himself be not openly and professedly blasphemed; if you think so, speak out. But consider your therefore once again; if it be well inferred from the premises, it must be thus; what the Magistrates in *Peter* and *Pauls* time did not meddle with, they have no power to meddle with now: but they did not meddle in matters of Christian Religion to establish any Laws for it and its Ministers; therefore, &c. A rare Argument for *Papists* and *Sectaries* to glory in! let them add too carelesse *Gallios* Speech, who professed he would be a Judge of no such matters; yea, and if they please the riot suffered by him before the very judgement seat!

Is 5. 4.

P. 4.

18. 15.

seat! most worthy Examples for believing Magistrates to take pattern by! But meddle they did not, belike out of tendernesse of conscience; *Nero* good man was afraid to invade the Churches privileges, or to touch Christs Royalty, to prepare for his Ministers; what an over-sight was this before *Gallio* and *Nero* reformed the world in it? what meant *David* to make such provision for the Temple, when *Pharaoh* meddled with no such things, when *Israel* was in *Egypt* (*Dauids* inspirations about these things were Propheticall, but his Sanctions about them were regal) nay and *Nebemiab* too stroke upon the same Rock of errour, as all the good kings of *Judah* had done before him, notwithstanding *Pharaohs* Example; for he also ventured to make Laws about the Worship of God, when *Nebuchadnezzar* had done no such thing when the people were in *Babylon*: Much in the same manner was *Constantine* guilty, who durst make Laws for the Church of Christ, which none of his predecessours ever did; Despise the laudable Examples of *Pharaoh*, *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Nero*? an high insolence I assure you; pitty we make not *Neros* commissions exemplary as well as his omissions; and so engage Magistrates to persecute Ministers as well as not provide for them. Oh how many are the things those men never meddled with, not only towards Christ, but also towards God and their own subjects, which it was their duty to have meddled with! It should be such things belonged not their Office; therefore they did well in not meddling with them; whereas you conclude strangely they meddled not with it: therefore it belonged not to their Office. We reverence the Examples of holy men of God, approved in Scripture; but the Examples of Heathen not approved, yea condemned in Scripture, as I have already proved abundantly, such Examples we desire may not be imposed upon any for a rule of practice; and if that motion be embraced, this Argument is vanished. Well, shut you up your Argument from Examples thus: O ye Rulers be ye followers of *Pharaoh*, *Nebuchadnezzar*, *Nero*, *Trajan*, *Severus*, *Diocletian*, &c. We on the other side will urge ours from Examples thus: O ye Rulers be ye the followers of *David*, *Asa*, *Jehoshaphat*, *Hezekiah*, *Josiah*, *Nebemiab*, *Constantine*, *Theodosius*, &c. And let them Judge of the patternes which they like best, as most becoming that holy name that is upon them. The Apostles gave us no such Example: true; the then Magistrates were not in a case to relieve them; and the then Christians needed no complaints of that nature to be made against them: or if any did as the *Corinthians* to *Paul*, a supply was made elsewhere as to him from the Brethren of *Macedonia*, though they were apt to create a jealousy, whether he loved them or no, from whom he would receive nothing, which he prevents and removes; any of these will answer as strong an Argument as this is. There are many that are so happy as never to need a Magistrate for the recovery of any debt whatsoever (the Apostles

Acts 18.15.

P. 7.

2 Cor. 11.8,9.

11.

1 Cor. 6. 11.

Apostles never used them for this ; and when some Christian did so, they are check'd for it) yet the Magistrates have power to help such injur'd ones if need be, or they have power for no thing.

P. 9.

Christ gave no such Precept (to sue for Tithes) What then ? therefore not lawful? Christ gave no such precept to sue for any debt, therefore not lawful : what think you ? It is enough that Magistrates have a precept from Christ to execute Judgment ; and though all men ought to make use of Magistrates Authority with much tenderneſſe, as their laſt refuge, and Miniſters eſpecially above others : yet when there is no remedy, the wrong cannot be ſuffered under, and no mediation will ſerve the turn ; it is then a liberty for them, and, as the caſe may be, a Duty, to make uſe of this Ordinance of Chriſt ; and Miniſters are not the onely perſons cut ſhort of the benefit of this common relief ; if we are, ſhew where : I think we lie under a peculiar duty above others, in as much as what Title we loſe, we loſe not to our children, but to ſucceeding Miniſters, and in them to the Church of God for ever. And whatever we have only the uſe of, we are bound to deliver it up as entire as we found it.

But is ſuing for Tithes peaceable ? I think not ; and I think yea : But muſt the matter goe by your thinking and mine ? Any that reads this, would take you to be as utter an enemy to Magiſtracy as ever Anabaptiſt was. Why ſhould ſuing for Tithes be more unpeaceable then ſuing for any thing elſe ? or a Miniſters ſuing more then another mans ? Suing is then unpeaceable, when it is upon claimes known to be unrighteous (if I verily think what I ſue for is not his that deraines it, I am not unpeaceable, if I humbly ſubmit my cauſe to the determination of thoſe Miniſters of God who ſerve for that very thing ; no, though I be in a miſtake, and it be his, not mine) if it be for trifles, which may be put up without any great damage : if we run haſtily to ſtrive, without trying all other remedies ; if the free, fair, and ſpeedy determination of the cauſe like to goe againſt us be hindred by our peeviſh revengeful ſpirits : Such circumſtances about ſuing may render it unpeaceable ; but in its ſelfe it is not ſo, but a moſt neceſſary remedy to keep men in peace, and not to right wrongs received with their own hands.

Rom. 13. 6.

P. 9. d.
Of the untruth-
neſſe of the Re-
lacion, ſee P. 5.

Leſt we ſhould ſay you are the Miniſters of men, and ſo no Miniſters of Chriſt, you deny Princes gift. Strange ! If it be Princes gift, will that make us more the Miniſters of men then if it be peoples gift ? You ſhould have put in lawes in ſtead of gift, ſo as I explained my ſelf ; Correct that now ; 'tis the Lawes of men were then, and are now ſpoken of. Let us then ſee whether a maintenance ſo had will make us Miniſters of men, and ſo no Miniſters of Chriſt. One proof me thinks of this Argument might have been adduced at leaſt,

least, to make it appear only so formidable, as that when it was a great way off only foreseen, we should run away from it; utterly deny that, which would have brought so dreadful a consequence upon us: The truth is, I foresaw no such consequence at all, much less was I afraid of it, neither doe I yet, though you have told me it: For, supposing such a Law, might not a man have gifts and grace from God for the work of the Ministry, might he not be stirred up to the work? might he not be invited to a people destitute of help, and accept of the invitation? Might he not be ordained to the Office of a Minister of Christ by Prayer and Fasting with the laying on the hands of the Presbytery? Might he not act in this Office as Gods Ambassador, Teaching, Exhorting, Commanding, Reproving, Comforting, exercise all that belongs to him in the whole power of the Keyes, by binding and loosing all in Gods name, and in Christs stead? Might he not be still employed in bringing men from the power of Satan unto God, and in edifying those that have been already called? Have not thousands done so since these Lawes have been in the world? Might they not receive all their encouragements from Christ, even this of faithful Magistrates under Christ, encouraging him in the work, as they commanded him to doe his duty in the work? How will this one thing dash all, he hath his maintenance from Christ by the hands of Christian Magistrates, who should have had it from Christ by the hands of Christian people?

But if this be to be Ministers of men, to be under the Authority of the Civil Magistrate; to be commanded by them to doe our duties; to be liable to punishment from them in case we neglect our duty; to be encouraged by them in our faithfulness to our duty; We owe our selves Ministers of men in such cases, and hope to be found the rather Ministers of Christ for so doing: And we do withal profess our selves bound thankfully to acknowledge all encouragements we receive from the Magistrates protection; to pray for them, and contribute our utmost endeavours to maintain their just Authority they have from God against all heady seditious Principles in matters of State, as they are bound to maintain that just Authority which we have from God against the like heady principles in matters of Religion: And we see, men would not believe it sooner; they that are giddy one way, are like enough to be soon giddy another way too. And when both doe our duties towards each other, we shall give Papists and Atheists (that I include not you) leave to mock on with such jeers as this, or, which they please, to gnash their teeth.

I say no more to this businessse then thus much, That Ministers and Subjects are the same persons, though under different Relations, both in the duties that belong to each agreeing very well together;

ther; and no good subject can from the supposition of the one, infer the denial of the other. It is the very Argument upon which Papists ground the Exemption of their Priests from the Jurisdiction of Princes. Pray do you forbear it, lest you make your self as bad a subject as they.

P. 17, 13.

If it be Civil, or Common, it may be done, or left undone, till the Magistrate compell it; and then it must be done. What strange work have we here! a Civil, or common thing; who would joyn those two words together to signifie one and the same thing, but my Neighbour? especially when the common thing is explained by a thing indifferent, which may be done or undone, till the stamp of Authority set upon it make it necessary? What, are all Civil things such? that Ministers maintenance must needs be such among the rest, if it come under a civil Sanction? Well fare your heart however, when you acknowledge that the stamp of the Magistrates power added to indifferent things, makes them necessary. But hath the Magistrate no power to set the stamp of his Authority upon things necessary? Are all things that come within his reach such as may be done or left undone, till he make Lawes about them? I had thought that the great work of the Judicial Lawes was to be a fence about the Moral; and that the main work of Magistrates was *To be a terror to evil doers, and to be for the praise of them that doe well*; the Rule of which doing well or ill is the Law of God! The best excuse for these things, is, that you wrote at random, and mended not what you wrote.

And that will further appear, if we take notice that this very foul mistake does most dangerously wound that very cause for which it is asserted. For, is it not your Doctrine, That the determinate proportion of what is to be paid to Ministers, is nowhere commanded by God: if so, then though a maintenance is due, yet this, or that proportion is indifferent; may be done, or left undone, and another chosen. Will not now the resolution of this *quota pars* according to your very rule, belong to the Magistrate, as a thing indifferent? The Consequence then to be heeded, will not be, if Magistrates please, Christs Ministers shall have a maintenance; and if they so please, they shall have none: But if Magistrates please, they shall have this maintenance in particular; or, if this please not, another; the determination of which indifferent thing (supposing it so to be) some men think will better become a faithful upright Magistrate, than the very best of our people, who are the persons must pay what is so determined. I hope we shall hear of this Argument no more, which is apparently false, and destructive to civil government in the proposition, and in the consequence cuts the throat of that cause for which it is produced.

P. 11.

In the last place Scriptures are produced against compulsion, as the

they which hinder the Gospel, and make it chargeable: to which purpose are alledged 1 Cor. 9. 15, 16, 17, 18. a Cor. 9. 7. and a Thef. 3. 6.

All which places speak not of the Magistrates power in making Lawes; but of the Ministers duty of remitting his maintenance due any how from a people, whether by a Law of man, or by the free contribution of the people; your self acknowledge they do immediately concern this, & so are not at all material to our present questions; for they are two things. The taking of a mans right by Law, which we speak of now: And the recovery of those rights so stated by him whole they are. They are just Lawes by which a Landlord may recover his Rent of his Tenant, yet there may be many cases wherein the Landlord may abuse his power in the use of it, to the hinderance of the Gospel: So it is in an higher degree here. Yet he that would make *Pauls* example, even as himself commends it to the Elders of *Ephesus*, who were not, so far as we know, extraordinarily gifted, nor did receive help from other Churches, so far as we know; both which are considerable differences in *Pauls* example) had need consider well that he make the cases alike. He must suppose a people newly brought to the Faith of Christ, a Minister contesting with false Apostles, whose glory it was to preach freely: Where not Neighbour, That it is the character of a false Apostle to preach taking nothing, and of it to glory; and a Minister enabled by skill in an ingenious Trade to earn his bread without destroying his bodily health. Where no publick maintenance is allowed for this Service, which is the Ministers propriety, and no mans else: this is our case, but was not *Pauls*, nor the Elders of *Ephesus*. We covet no mans silver, but allow every man to take a moderate share in what is ours, and allow it most contentedly without grudging it them: For my part, God knows my sincerity. Whether this be not beyond *Pauls* Example, let others judge. And yet then, when the cases are made the same (if it were possible) what would *Pauls* Example binde to? onely this much, to deny our selves in the possession and use of our right upon twelvety considerations for the Gospel sake; not in the right and title; that was eagerly stood to by him, and not denied by them. Now it hath been the matter of Right hath been in question between you and I, not the exacting of the use of this right where it is acknowledged; and this is none of mine, the Apostle durst not give up his right to a maintenance, neither dare I to this.

Adde as the Close of all, that whereas 2 Cor. 8. and 2 Cor. 9. are chiefly alledged against a constrained maintenance by the Civil Magistrates Authority; they doe directly belong to provisions for the poor, onely by consequence, if at all (of that above) provisions for Ministers. Now if the Magistrate determine any thing as to us whom

P. 23.

Acts 20. 34. 35.

2 Cor. 11. 12.

P. 9.
Acts 18. 3.

where the place concern not but by consequence, you obey not: whereas if the Magistrate determine any thing, as to the poor, of whom the places alledged speak directly, you resist not, so far as ever I heard, none of you. Now what perverseness is this? Consider your ways.

I have with most punctual exactness considered all that hath the least shew of a reason against the Power and Duty of the Civil Magistrate. The Lord help you to a clear understanding, to discern the exceeding emptiness and insufficiency of them; and to an humble heart, that you may be willing, upon so plain and full a discovery, to lay aside your Error. The matter is of very great weight; and obstinacy in a bad or evil, to preserve the reputation of our wisdom, will be an heinous crime in any Cause, much more in this.

As a Conclusion of this Discourse, I shall adde some general Answers to other much Exceptions against the Magistrates making Laws in matters of Religion; and then I shall have done with the second Plea.

The first Pretence is the difficulty of defining to the Magistrate his due bounds in such matters: All yield some infirmities of mind, as to the belief of Truth allowable, as well as some infirmities of heart, as to the practice of Duty. And where shall we set the bounds? why such a difficulty now more then under the Old Testament? Hath Christ given us the Gospel to obscure the Truths of God, or to make them more illustrious? At least sin there; this is first sight is reasonable, let the bounds that then were, as to matters moral and perpetual, be now.

2. May we not agree thus far, to restrain men from trampling under their feet that blood which must save them, and from doing despite to the Spirit of Grace; keep men from committing that sin which shall never be forgiven them? 3. Can we punish an Adulterer with death, and yet tolerate those filthy Principles through which he was led to commit it? 4. If men hold principles formally destructive of Civil Government, shall these by that Law be tolerated, by which Civil Government is upheld? For my part I profess, though I am not so self-conceitedly cruel as to wish nothing tolerated; yet I cannot but tremble at an Act of Toleration for any thing that is evil: For what is that but to make a State-allowance for men to sin? Should I hear of an Act of Toleration to but an officious Syc, I should think it an evil greatly to be lamented, yet I would not have every such one hailed to the tribunal of publick Justice for it. If any thing be to be declared in the matter of Toleration, it were more proper to declare severely what they will not tolerate, then what they will.

But

(92)

But this Conscience is a tender thing, and may not be forced; Religion is not to be beaten, but persuaded into men; thus the way of the *Gentiles* Conversion Prophesied of. Why? *Laws Politick* have for their end to revenge the evil done, by executing wrath upon the doer, to the terror of others, the recovery and salvation of the offender, only so far as is consistent with this. So in other matters, why not so here too? Must Conscience be made a sacred Asylum for all manner of villanies to have a refuge to, and there defie the justest Lawes that are made against them? *Thou shalt take him from my Altar thus he die*, saith God. Every Malefactor may escape thus. Gen. 9. 27.
Rom. 13. 4.

But are Pernal Lawes no helps towards the conversion of him that suffers them unadvisedly; sure God whips men so often into pure Consciences by several chastisements. A power indeed there goes with the Rod; but it would be a power alone if the Rod did nothing: Nor so fitly sure is chastening children, so often commanded unto Parents. All other Parents come to their children with a Rod heavenly and earthly; and they suppose and finde it to their childrens good profit: Shall the publick Father alone either have no Rod, or his an unprofitable one? Rods do not change the heart, but they may awaken the secure quiet sinner unto a consideration of his wayes; they may soften the hearts stubbornness, though then is another hand must set to the seal when the wax is softened: when they doe least, they may restrain the impudent profession of sin, though they cannot remove the love of sin in the heart. Laws against Murder and Adultery cannot take away the inclination of the heart to such sins; yet are they not in vain. We cannot by law change a sinners heart; but we may change his place by Law. Our Justices in *New-England* can banish them whom they cannot reclaim. We cannot by Law change mens hearts; yet we may by Law encourage them who by Christ are employed for that very purpose, and remove from them those that seduce and pervert them; and this will go very far towards the changing of their hearts. If conscience be a thing that cannot be forced, why fear we making Laws about it? If Lawes are good, they may direct, warn, draw a bad conscience; and it were not much strange if they could force it: better is a forced good, then a free evil. If Lawes are bad, why fear we? they may discover a bad conscience; but they cannot force the good. Eccl. 7. 14.

But here is another fore Objection; Few men are good and great too. Not many mighty. *Belshazzars* message to King *James*; when he lay upon his death-bed is too true. He was a going to that place whither few Kings would follow him; he would not the rather but the perfection of the good conscience, rather than the punishment of the evil. Were it not better that known Malefactors should

Be spared now, that hereafter if ungracious Magistrates be set up in
 wreath, Gods people may be spared under them? Doubtless a very
 subtil device; and pity that *Hezekiah* did not wisely foresee what
 the condition of Gods people might be under his Son *Masasseh*, and
 tolerate Idolaters under his Reign, that so *Masasseh* might tolerate
 the true worshippers under his. May let us enlarge this politick
 counsel too: If Parents and Masters that are godly, should suffer sin
 in their children and servants, in hopes that the many Parents and
 Masters that are wicked, will doe the like to their children and ser-
 vants that are godly: would it not be a deep designe too? especi-
 ally the good Parents and Masters being so few, and the bad so ma-
 ny? What care doe men take sincere Christians may never feel the
 Crosse! Yet that was one of Christs Legacies to his; it was the Apo-
 stles glory, is that to which all they that will live godly are appointed:
 and the first Christians counted them happy that endured; but with
 us, how effeminate, and worldly, and ambitious a thing is the pro-
 fession of Religion grown to be! Grace shal spare sin, that sin hereafter
 may spare grace: Have we this league within us too? or are we sure
 sin will stand to the terms? never look that wicked ones will deale
 so gently with the good conscience as we expect they should. Pa-
 pists never yet gave us any such instances to hope for; and if the wit-
 nesses be not yet slain by them (and far wiser men then I think
 they are not) there is a sea of blood more to be added to what is
 under the Whores skirts already: Pray how long is it since the Lion
 turned Lamb? Blood is an essential ingredient in the Religion of a
 Papist; and let those who have received the most deadly principles
 that Popery hath in the Doctrinal part of it already, adde but the o-
 pen profission of Popery; yea, let them but hold the same things
 with other names, and go on with their serpents, vipers, filthy beasts,
 dogs; and such names as these innocent meek ones please to give us,
 the Magistrate in the mean time clapping all sides on the back, only
 holding a sword between them to keep them asunder; and who
 can expect but these two seas should in time meet in one? and that
 then words should be turned to blows, and we deale with all those
 any some creatures we are likened to are prone to be? This they
 would doe; becoming Papists; though they were here then they
 are in the land into a wolf and it will devour flesh though it be not
 now. And if we tolerate not the name of Popery, it will be finally
 to our relief, if we tolerate the thing; names shed no blood. Look
 to it therefore ye Magistrates supream and subordinate; drive away
 those blood-sucking leeches out of the Nation; under what favour'd
 disguise soever you finde them. Let not these fiends of Egypt creep
 into your Life-garment and Bed-chamber. Sh Papists have under every
 garment hid us where they lurked to begin: O God and Queen
 them think to escape when her fellow-worms are massacred, to them

But why should we be excused to the liberty of men's consciences? especially we that are so lately come out of bondage: our selves? what advantage is it to bereave men of that precious freedom, which is purchased for them by the blood of Christ?

It is so indeed; and if this be such a freedom as is purchased by Christ's blood, we have done, and shall never speak more against men, enjoying the sweet benefit of it. But did ever Christ purchase a freedom for us from those commands of men that require us to do our duty? did he do so to servants, or children, or wives, that he should be thought to do so to subjects? There were such ignorant and malicious ones that thought so in the Apostles time too; but Christian freedom was not to be abused so. What, does the grace of the Gospel intend to make us men of Belial, lawless, and without a yoke? to believe what we list, and do and speak in matters of Religion what we list? why not a freedom to murder, adultery, treason as well? Is it not as likely that Christ's blood should be shed for these, as for blasphemy against his own person? These are sad reasonings from men of wisdom; the Lord in mercy answer them, that men may once learn the truth of such maxims as these, That it is man's greatest slavery to be free to sin. That government is in vain appointed, if men may do and speak what they please under it. That there is a great difference between execution of justice, and persecution. That Christ's blood was shed to make us free to good, not free to evil. That Christianity diminishes not the just rights of any lawful Superiour, nor frees any from a due subjection to the powers over them; as it finds in these things, so it leaves: Saints must be subject, as well as other men. That though God alone make Lawes to binde mens consciences, yet men may guide mens consciences to the obedience of those Lawes, and punish the disobeying person, though they meddle not with his conscience. That it will be no plea allowed at the day of God, in matters of sin, to say, *It was my Conscience*: And if it will not excuse the finger from Hell, he should not have had such a conscience; much less ought it to be a plea in the day of man, where the penalty is of a lower nature. That it is far better to suffer for doing well, then not to be restrained from doing ill. That Magistrates should have consciences as well as subjects; and if it be according to their consciences to be a terror to evil doers, (I am sure it should be) why may not they plead this freedom of conscience upon the same ground as evil doers plead it, that they may go unpunished? If Magistrates omit a known duty, they wound their consciences; if the evil doer (suppose the well doer) suffer under the mistake of Magistrates, his conscience is not presently wounded here, who then should rather be the two be provided for? That a Liberty to obey God without fear of man, is a choice mercy, not a liberty to disobey God. That when

when Magistrates lay more upon men, in matters of Religion, than God hath commanded, there Liberty of Conscience is a Jewel; but where they lay no more than things necessary, not so. When they can say truly It seemes good to the Holy Ghost, no great harm if any to us follow, no not from them. That it is a more fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God, then of a mortal man; and that if we did judge ourselves, we should not be judged. We know the Story; The Mothers seasonable and sharp correcting her son, might have prevented her unprofitable weeping for him when she saw him at the Gallows. Therefore, That the allowing every man to worship God peaceably in his own way, becomes them only that suppose every man may be saved in his own Religion, living orderly, according to the Rules of it; and to such the Faith of Christ owes little: If this were true, it were better be for Mahomet, for his Rules afford greater liberty then Christs do.

But we are as much Hereticks in their eyes, as they are in ours. It appears so indeed by the language they vouchsafe us. But the question is not what either side is named, but how justly. The Prince is as much a Tyrant in the Assassins eyes, as he is a Traitor in the Princes: Strange! that we should not transfer the reason of these things as easily, and with as little scruples to matters of God, as we do to our own.

But such things are contrary to the light of nature; things whereof we speak, are only contrary to revealed light, the light of Scripture. There is a generation that reject this distinction; I hope they will expect no benefit by it. For others, 'tis much that the gatherer of sticks on the Sabbath day could not finde out this distinction to save himself from stoning with. Have we not as good evidences for the New Testament doctrine, as they had for the old? The Doctrine of the Gospel is revealed sufficiently to damn them that will not believe it; and may not men be punished on earth for blaspheming it, for want of a sufficient Revelation? Take heed, do not make God unrighteous, who taketh vengeance. It is as hard a matter to be assured of that Law of Nature, No woman but one, that it is of God, as it is to be assured of that Law of Scripture, No Mediator but one, that this is of God. Let any man compare the Evidences for both, and he will quickly see this is truth; and yet the sinners of having two wives is justly punished with death. What man can see so much of the Law of Nature written in his own heart, as he may see of it written in Scripture? let him add the help of all the great Masters of Nature that ever wrote in the world. Paul was of our mind in this thing, when he tells us he had not known sin by the Law. And Scripture is cleare in that which is knowable only by revealed light, then it is in that which is part is also knowable by the light of Nature, if in any thing it exceed itself in cleareness.

Rom. 7.7.

True,

True, but men know not Scripture so well as they might, and they must be acquainted with this greater Light, else it will not condemn them. Nor know Scripture? we know them that insisted and pleaded for this; they will tell you none know Scripture but they. But what do they not know? Not that there is but one Christ; that we are purchased by the blood of God; that to lye against the Holy Ghost, is a lye against God, &c. We speak not of things doubtfully defined, or of tolerable differences in the less vital parts of Religion: Men here may be ignorant of Scripture, and God forbid we should stir up Magistrates against them, if they would hold peace, bleneth and unity; but are they ignorant of such things as these? how dare they? how can they? will God take this at their hands for a sufficient answer? and in their ignorance will they venture to blaspheme too? May not some Ranter with as good Arguments plead that Adultery is no sin? and Levellers, that to overthrow all propriety is no sin; and Traitors, that to assassinate Magistrates, is no sin? will ignorance excuse here? They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them. We are under the highest dispensation for the attaining of knowledge, and by it eternal life already: If therefore men hear not these, we may well conclude, *Neither will they be saved though one rise from the dead.*

But these are innocent creatures, hurt no body with their evil; 'tis to themselves, and there is none the worse for it. Most false this of the smallest Error; that is, much more of those souls enormous ones against the first Principles of the Gospel. Why should God be provoked, and his vengeance brought upon the Nation? Is it not evil that the Word loseth its Authority, upon sinners, to their eternal undoing, through the perpetual violent clamours of contradicting men? That Gods worship is visibly and professedly despised with that impudence, as no Turk almost durst doe the like? That thousands of well-meaning people are drawn aside, to the hazard of their souls? That mutual evil speakings, estrangements, oppositions, heart-burnings boiling up the more for a State connivance, prepare for civil Combinations, and letting one anothers blood? That all offices of mutual love are forgotten? The great Gospel-law of Unity broken; and we that live but two fields asunder, should be as far from one another, when call'd to assist in any work of mercy for common good, as if we liv'd at a hundred miles distance? Truly, why was *Hyman* delivered to Satan? *I would they were even cut off that trouble you.* What a trouble is this against false Teachers? Surely *Paul* was too fully, Gal. 5.12. he was not merciful enough to tender Conscience. What need all that art in 2 Cor. against false Teachers? good men they were for Christ as well as he, only for *Heretic* and *Division* sake. Why

Should Christ threaten the 7 Churches of Asia so sharply? Teaching
 Persecution, what harm had the Doctrines his children should
 be filled with death? See pray, False Doctrine was the sin of these
 Churches: Christ himself was the Tincasser, he hath exposed
 these threatenings long since: Ladders is not to be found upon the
 face of the earth; his swallowed up under ground, to sow our
 of the mouth of Christ too. So great an enemy to render Consci-
 entia Christ himself: To teach us all what a kind of mercy it is to
 spare John, and such Malefactors as are worse then Jesuits, for the
 whole Nation to be involved in the curse of God and Christ.



The Ministers third Plea for his Portion.

The Right of Donation.

I Am now at last arrived at the last of our Pleas for the right of
 Tithes, my Neighbours own beloved free will-offering: the Plea
 I have alone insisted upon to him; it being with me a Rule,
 that if the same things may be obtained upon principles not con-
 troverted, I would never trouble men with those that were. I have
 found success in so doing with other persons in other matters (bless-
 ed be God) but have been extremely unhappy with my Neighbour
 in this: he is seems interpreting my peaceable forbearance of things
 controverted, to be from an inward conviction of the badness of the
 cause I was engaged in; and for filthy lucre sake was resolved to
 persist in; and desired as well as I could; however the relieving of him
 from those uncharitable thoughts hath been the design of what hath
 been said upon the two former Arguments; that he may know there
 is enough from both to bottom, a good conscience on what I have
 done and do. I have little to say to this third, because there is little
 said against it; if it were so, sayes my Neighbour, I might refuse it;
 yet himself shows in not one word to prove it will be refused
 self gives us some instances publick and private to prove what he
 the most part of that little answer he gives, runs up on the supposition
 that it was so; as that it was out of a Popish persuasion, that they
 were given by the Law of God, &c. yet he refuses, not, though
 himself acknowledge himself to be so, which he contradicts both
 by our Argument to the contrary; nay he supposes, nay he proves.

To

To what purpose then my Christian Friend, that wild extravagant discourse of Tyrant Kings, giving away what's none of their own? yet conquest upon a righteous War is a just Title, though *William* was no *Conqueror*, held not his Crown by that Title; much less does *Oliver Protector*: *The Beast* Rev. 13. and the *Whore*, c. 17: what come they in for? Do they prove themselves the Beasts off-spring by freely giving their own, and the Whores by taking what is freely given? Remember man, 'tis the Right of Donation is now stood upon, which you reply to. Why should I mind King *Henry VIII.* suppressing the Popes supremacy and taking it to himself? or our reverend Fathers the Bishops, the Lords Bishops? What's all this to the Title of *Free Donation*? and what is this better before God think you then the hood &c. This, what? Free Gift? Is this also from that Holy Father the *Pope*? What have we here to do with *Henry the VIII.* taking of Parsonages, with Princes Laws, or *Popes* workings: Our Flock if Faithful, will be a willing people, they have been so, have freely given; it is not left to the Magistrates pleasure, Princes and people have freely given; what would you have more? the Donation does not confound it self, neither does your confused writing nothing to the purpose confound it.

But we claime it as a free Gift! True, you told us so P. 10. but were sensible it seems of your wild running away from it, in that and the next Page: so now you will return to it; no, not now neither; 'tis a Bears ear, he dares not touch it; then I have no right to it, but as a Rector, be it so as a Rector I claime it; what is this Doctrine new to you? Ministers are Servants, 2 Cor. 4. 5. but for Jesus sake; and they are Rulers too; their Rule is Ministerial, they have an high merciful end for which they serve, and they Rule by directing and commanding to that way which leads by Gods appointment to this end. Then I dare trust an old (the elder the better Title) *Popes Donation*, *Popes* man? their own who were owners of the Land; is it not so in your Plea as your self relate it but three Lines before? Then Christs Ordination: why? we speak now of Free-gift, is not that Christs Ordination? Now being put from your Divine Plea, not by your reasons, I assure you: but be it so; we now speak of Donation. I pray tell me what proportion it is; but the Free-gift of the Giver? you have told the world twice, 'tis that very thing we speak of; did you ever find it a tenth by Christs appointment? why? You have told men but just now we are put off from our Divine Plea; this is it stand, and crow over us a while after you have beaten us from that ground; with come hither again if you dare (you see I have ventured however) but pursue your Victory; you see we have taken field again upon another ground, that of Free-gift. I pray be not offended, I pray take it in good part; now speak to the business honestly and fairly; and I will not be offended; but this is tire some; though not

P. 11.

P. 11.

P. 12.

Luc. 12. 42.

Hebr. 13. 17, 24.

1 Cor. 16. 16.

1 Tim. 4. 11.

M

M

the first time you have exercised my patience: if not by the Law of God, again that will you never have done conquering. Nor by the Gift of indulgent Princes: we proclaimed it by the Gift of indulgent Princes and people, and your self have sold the world as much for us twice already: what is it you now answer to but this? but by some old Popish Statute. I tell you we have done with Statutes now, Popish or not Popish: tis Free-gift we speak of. After *Auslin* coming into England, tithes were not required: but Free-gift was the only maintenance: man, & that you are now pressed with, Free-gift, and that of Tithes, we prove in from above those very times in which men blind, and in those dayes, could but read a Homily: in those dayes, *Auslin*? did they read in the Book of Homilies then? and what if they did, then or since? what's this to Donation? Yet now must they rather turn back again, as it were into Egypt for onions and garlick, then to feed upon *Manna*: the Lords Free-gift. Why, tis that very *Manna* we plead for, the Free-gift you speak of. Therefore thus to your Paper. For *Ham*, you should not have mentioned such a word, who have not promised in which you pretend to answer it; you might have put it easily into the margin page. But what to my Paper? It was Christs Prerogative to provide for his houses he hath to doe, and charged his Ministers wages into a Free-gift, and not Tithes into a free-gift of Tithes let it passe so now. Twice you have told men so, that thus we plead, and do not you yet know it your self? Yet you have not done your wandring: next come exceptions against Lawes Civil, for the recovering of Tithes, be it a carnal reasoning to say, if a Minister may not sue, he may starve. What's this to Free-gift? A Free-gift may be sued for, as in the case of Legacies. Is it not strange (all things considered) well, you are a very considerate man; but what is so strange? that ever National Teachers should desert the Church of Rome and yet love the *Diana* of Tithes so much. You that have considered all things, tell us but one reason why this should seem strange: But 'tis a Free-gift we love, 'tis that we now stand upon, your *Diana*, if that word please you so well: Rome would not trust Princes with such a thing; and truly it seemeth to me that this is that the National Teachers mainly want, to be not only Bishops, but Lord Bishops. No, no, oh dispute not against that, that cause will not now trouble you, you have another before you, he changed it into a Free-gift: the very thing we speak of. He left it not to the pleasure of Magistrates, then his faithful Ministers should hardly get a Livelyhood, yes, by Free-will Offerings, as well the Magistrate neglecting his duty, as if we suppose him to have none at all. But we trouble not Magistrates now: 'tis the Free-gift we speak of. Then the lying story (a most impudent slander) comes in, of me and my Predecessor, of which before Nothing at all to the Donation, for four pages after an Answer to this Plea was undertaken.

Reader,

Reader, I relate not all this for the consideration of what is said by him, or reply'd by me; nor yet to make my self and my Reader sport; to refresh us in a debate of serionnels; there needs no foot in the play here! But this I relate it for, that my Neighbour may see how little he hath said to the business against the only foundation I gave him for my Right in Tithes; and that the world may see, that notwithstanding any strength in his Reasons against my plea, we needed not have troubled our selves to print, nor others in reading what we have printed.

But you have done your wandrings, and now you come the third time to the business: You have played off and on long enough, you will fasten now. What say you now? You have spent four pages in rambling about, and now you come to it. You cut us off at the end of the four with six lines, and then easily conclude: I hope you will now desist. Why, the strength of your whole Book should have bent upon this, to overthrow this Donation. You know it was my only Plea to you; and you confess as much, this you could not yield to. I would venture anything rather than pay upon this ground: And are six lines enough for that which hath to great a stroke in the whole Cause? Were I as censoriously addicted as you self, I should from these things infer, that Faction and Emulation, that you may seem stout as well as others, hath carried you on in this Cause against your Conscience: But I doe not so judge you; the Lord help you to judge your self, and to be contented to blame your self for your many miscarriages in this matter, by a humble reforming restoring Repentance, not only of your Brothers goods, but your Brethrens good names more precious to us then our goods: For my part, I shall rather impute this to the craziness of your head, then to the malice of your heart.

But these six lines are full of weight however, and strike the matter dead at a stroke: See what they are fraught with. *Each thing, and therein you see beyond my memory and understanding, and I now must take your word for it.* Your Landlord will expect you should take his word for his Title to the rent, and I may as well expect you should take my word for my Title to the Tenth. Tenants are not wont to enquire into Titles; if so stop according to Law, they pay their rent where it is pretended to be due, and shall not engage you to take my word; you had time enough given you to search into the truth of my Plea. Will it be beyond your memory? This makes the Title the better in all Law and Reason, it possition be field by virtue of that put on all along, and why cannot you understand this? It is as hard in other cases, as to the right to Hospitals, to Colleges, to Schools. Can you understand how it should be perfectly Bequeathed to them? And is the like to what sets may not so be understood? Can you understand how a man

may by will pass over his Estate to his children and their posterity for ever? and is it not as easie to be understood how he may give gifts to other persons out of those Lands, either for a time, or for ever? what thing more ordinary? How hard is man to understand what he would not should be true!

P. 10.

But you know no such thing. Before you withheld your payment, you ought to have known the contrary: It seems for what you know you have wronged me; and, as it is certainly none of your, so it it may possibly be mine by as good a Right as ever man enjoyed a Legacie for ought you know. This may be then; and if it be, you must resign, your self hath said it: Now what have you done to quiet Conscience in not resigning? have you consulted with those Records which might give light about such ancient things? Have you enquired of one able Lawyer, to know the truth of this pretended Right? Shew me one among so many friends and adversaries that will give it under his hand, that the pretended Donation of Tithes in England is a meer forgery, a *Constantine's Donation*: Oh Neighbour, surely conscience hath been much asleep, if you can withhold a payment due upon the supposition of such a gift, by your own confession, without so much as once examining whether there were such a gift or no. Is it possible that a tender conscience should not tremble to keep goods in his hands, which for ought he knows, belong to another man, is, or may be sure they belong not to him, and that with so much eagerness of contention? I hope you are not altogether without such motions of fear; I would not have you past feeling.

But it concerns me to prove such a gift who claim by it. By no means, no owner of Land, who hath enjoyed possession by descent for many generations, would think it equal to be forced to shew how they came first into the Family. No Purchaser of Lands troubles himself with such a question; above 60. years uninterrupted possession is enough. How many are able to shew how their Estates come to them from 450. years? Even Mr. *Selden*, whose grant is counted most sparing, yields us so much for Parochial Tithes, and for Tithes paid at large, much sooner. And must Ministers be put to that which no man else is? are we persons incapable of common Justice, the benefit of that which a Turk having possessions here might enjoy? are we wilde beasts, that may be destroyed any how, *per se et non per alios*? Surely others will count it enough to justify a Tide long enjoyed against any thing may be alledged by any man to the contrary: yes, and others will provide they bring their plea within the memory of man; other wise they expect it should not be admitted at all; no man being supposed to be so long negligent in his own matters, if he be *currit lex contra negligentem* and there must be an end of strife. But so shall not I deal with you; do you shew how a Right to the goods

History of
Tithes, c. 10.
P. 235.

questioned, hath descended to you by any Lawful means, from any person who ever the owner of *Spillbill* farm, either within, or without the memory of man: and if I do not prove mine a better Title, I will give over my right.

Suppose a Landlord, altogether unacquainted with the Lawes of the Land, cannot at all prove his Title to his goods or land he holds, must he therefore forfeit them to him that uses the land, who hath no title at all to them? Examining old deeds of gift belongs to another profession, not to yours and mine. How many deeds of gift were never entered upon Record? how many Records are worn away by the injury of time, or consumed by several casualties? May we not verily believe that to be true, which is verily affirmed by all knowing men, friends and enemies, and that in a matter of fact, without further enquiry? I know no man that ever denied that such Donations have been, no not those those that precisely write against them.

He thinks in a business that belongs to another calling, it might be a fair Argument to suppose such a thing done, when we see things that are not likely to have come to pass otherwise. Imagine the thing to be done now; if one or two might be gull'd, or forced, might all men be cheated out of so considerable a part of their estates, let it go they know not how? or if this generation could be so stupid, would the next be in so deep a sleep too? so universal a violence upon that which our Forefathers were as tender of as we, their estates, pass away in silence age after age, no man among the many thousand covetous persons, haters of God, his Word, and the Ministry of it to this day not opening his mouth to the contrary: especially when we finde such tugging about the manner of enjoying these deeds of gift, as about wood-land, new-broke ground, &c. They that had courage enough to question the manner, would they not much more have questioned the thing, if any just cause had been found? Less matters then this would satisfy me that the thing was done by consent, as their own act and deed; I know not what will you.

Yes I shall try a little further. Donations are either publick or private; we have both, if both will serve. Of the former you may peruse a Book entitled, *The Civil Right of Tithe*, by C. E. sent down to me by the name of *Elderfield*, among which the very first, and most ancient hits our present *Cuse*. A deed of gift related in that famous Law of *Edward the Conqueror* about Tithing, made long before under the first *Saxon Christian King Ethelbert*, Concessa sunt a rege, *Baronibus & populo* they are granted by King, Barons, and people: this you see not by tyrant Kings that thought every looke of land their own; but very orderly, King, his Barons theirs, and peoples theirs, and this in Kent too; and that I hope includes *Spillbill* Farm.

What need we now look for private Donations since made? they were indeed more truly reflections of what was sacrilegiously withheld through the calamity of those hard times under the Danish and Norman

Civil. Right,
P. 62.

About the year
600.

The long uncertain fluctuating of Titbes, till they settled in a fixed Parochial Right, demonstrates the first payments, as to any Laws of men were arbitrary.

Norman Invasions: a thing can truly be given but once. We have the Record for above 1000 years confirmed since, restored, spread, ed, and had recovered since, to this very day, will not this alone constitute a Right? Yet Selden in his History of Tithes, and fully in his Animadversions upon the History in both C. 8. & 9. dem- onstrates the first payments, as to any Laws of men were arbitrary.

But admit these many arbitrary private Consecrations (or restrictions) of what was long before consecrated? yet *Graveyard Bill* Farm will not be included in them; as if men were not privileged here to bestow their own goods (if yet they were their own) by free consent, as well as others were by troops in other places. Did others freely elsewhere, and were men here forced to do it was possession hath been delivered up to the Rectors of *Graveyard*, by them enjoyed many generations, none contradicting, who will say (though all Records should have perished, of nothing ever Recorded at all) but that the Consecration here was of the same nature as all elsewhere were, free and voluntary: yea, so far were men from being forced to do it, that they were forced to get leave to do it, and to see that their laid free donations might be secured by legal confirmation: such need was there thought to be, that both should be set to men superabundant bounty in those times.

Be not contentious, Neighbour, pray be not so. In this sense you that such a thing was done; it remains now to examine how well it was done. This more modest advertiser in this Cause are contented with, and why not well done? No man can lawfully give away the labours of another that is yet unborn, and it were lawful for men by Will to make slaves of their posterity for ever. Pray look back to p. 2. *Abraham gave it, and Jacob was it, the possession of the Parents did bind the children.* Yet children are not mentioned in either *Abraham's* gift, or *Jacob's* vow. And we have expected their will to stand for ever; many with solemn imprecations against them that should ever after what they have consecrated: yet neither of them were owners of such Land all their life-time, were not owners of a Robt. Land at the time of their Devotions; yet they might bind the children to pay Tithes out of what they never gave them. As for our Fathers, when they made their children to pay Tithes out of the Land they give them; they make their children slaves: I suppose without labour to Tithes, they way through the calamity of those past times might have been

true, then as well as now. I would you would see how your pleading against our Donation confounds it self.

Well, this was a slip in your memory (that I say no, in your conscience, to write any thing as it fits your present turn) which will you now part with, that Observation, of this Argument? The Observation is one of the main Sins in your Book, Abraham and Jacob gave and *gave it freely*; then God commanded it justly, and gave it to Levi graciously. The free gift going before, made the reason of the equity of the command following after, which would have no force but upon this supposal, that their possession was bound by the Free gift of their Ancestors.

What you will do here, I know not; I should advise you to let go rather this Argument for all your confident conclusion upon it: I hope you will now desist. For pray tell me in seriousness, should your Landlord by a deed of gift pass over to you & your heirs all his right and title in *Spittle*, and the Land about it free from all incumbrances, *free* from all such as the Minister only charging it with a rent-charge of 10 lb. to be the poor of *Spittle* for ever: would you cry out upon your Landlord as one that meant to make a slave of you? you would think there was you know how much given you by the year for ever, and a good penny worth to him that uses it, paying him well for his Stock and Labour upon it besides. If the Rent-charge you are bound to should be a 3. or 4. you would count so much less given you, as the Rent-charge is increased, if he should let the Rent-charge higher then the land is worth, so much as when it is paid, there will not remain enough to pay the user for his paines; then I suppose you would increase your Landlord to keep his gifts so himself, and be contented to be his Tenant still. This would not be to make you a slave for here would be no violence; if you did not like his gift, you might let it alone: you know how to apply. I hope you will desist your using this Argument any more. And here's all I find against our Donation where it is purposely spoken no. But I shall run up out of the whole Book what is to be found to invalidate our plea. The next Exception is against the badness of the principles upon which it is supposed to have been done: they indeed amiss, will weaken the acceptance of such things with God, but not a good title among men. But see what is said. They seized all their ground for burial of the *Mohametan* Law of God. And again, *A* King on his death-bed did give the tenth of all his Land to the Priests; *inments* Char- that then were, but it was out of a Popish persuasion that they were duster of England. by the Law of God, and *all men* Popish then. It can be not true, sure, Titling Table by you have overlaid too much. Examine we now the particulars of England. Were all Popish then? what no Marys? Look your Book and see, but all within the compassion of Laws were so. What Record have you for this? who says so, besides your self? none doubtless but they

P. 14.

P. 6.

P. 10.

they who are wont to ask us where our Church was before *Luther*. Our common answer to that Popish raunt is point-blank contradictory to this Assertion of yours, it was where it is now; for all was not Popish then, not in their form of worship: for did you never hear of the famous *Peter Moulins* Confutation of Popery out of their own Mass-book? much less were all Papists in that communion. Is it not known, that *Luther* rising up to preach against the Pope, did it *plaudente orbe universo*, the whole world applauding him. Did not the Christian world groan under the burden of Popish tyranny, and cry out for a free General Council, or any effectual means of Reformation? do not all our Writers against *Rome* prove by sensible demonstrations, that Poperie that now is, was but a Faction in the Church, bringing in their innovations, now one, then another, till they were advanced into that body they are now in by the Council of *Trent*? yes, it was possible, that errors creeping in by degrees, and not imposed upon any of necessitie, should at once carry away all like a flood before them, no man opening his mouth, nor so much as believing to the contrary: where was the voice of the true Shepherd then? could *Arminianism* rush in so upon us in the Bishops times, or can it now as it is brought in again at the back door by Sectaries? yes, do not all know what moderation there was in many of the *Trent*-Fathers, and how many of them were sent away in disgrace, all overborn by the violence of the Romish parties? If all was Popish, what need the Pope fear so much a General Council as he did? what need that packing & shuffling as was in *Trent*? why so many Italian Bishops, many of them titular ones, thrust in, so much exceeding those from other Nations, that they might over-balance all good motions by their numbers? what need things be so strangely carried there, that their own friends cried shame of it, and the French Nation for a long time rejected it as an unlawful Council? and yet this a *Conventicle* pack'd for the nonce to carry on the Popish cause, otherwise great fear lest their cake should have proved dough too. Nay when many, I know not but all, of our Divines doubt not but God hath his company in the midst of Poperie at this day, now that so considerable Bodies of Nations are departed from them, and they as evil men & seducers are wont to do, wax worse and worse; and they think *Rev. 18. 4.* leads them plainly to be of that mind: yet this man makes no bones of concluding concerning the former much better times of Romish communion, that all was Popish then. Not likely such considerable bodies should have fallen off from them at the time of Reformation; and no doubt of them that shook their heads at the Romish abominations, yet durst not depart from that Communion. *Erasmus* was not the man only neither. I have found perverse men ready to say any thing rather than let go an error they have once espoused. Let it not be so with you, Neighbour, I am assured you wrote this inconsiderately, rashly,

rally, and kindly, as you have many things in this Book besides: It is certainly narrow, and much dishonourable to our common Faith; no Papist but will be glad of such a concession; and no Protestant, I think, knowing or speaking, ever yielded it to you. Let it go for Ours, and let no more such trivial Affections fall from you.

That the Aids and Monuments fetch all their ground for Tithes out of the Mosaic Law, does not appear to me: I finde little disposed for tithes; and two Martyrs, *Walter Batson* in Aish, a Monk, and *William Thury* in *Henry 8.* time, disposing against it; the former against the necessity of them, the latter against the lawfulness: in both little is said in their behalf; only one word from the Archbishop to *Torrington* of any weight. *They would hardly make the Old Law more free and perfect than the New Law, and this is a New Testament Argument.* I had also King *Edward* give above Recorded, and for it allged *Isaiah* vow, a place in *Isaiah*, and a sentence much used by the Fathers. *If thou withhold from God, he will withhold from thee the blessing; or on that purpose.* But the Mosaic Law I finde not urged by any, much less than only. Other things are said, that are so silly; yet I may be deceived; something may change my belief; for you may perhaps make that ground otherwise; yet that ground is not all, if anywhere at all; herein your religion must be blamed. So when it is said a King at his death-bod gave to the Priests that then were; I cannot easily say no; yet I doubt this is not so, they were wont to give to God and the Church; and that it was out of a Popish persuasion that they were due by the Law of God: I want your proof for the fact; you did all you for it now down. For the Charter of England, it only confirms the Rights and Liberties thereof then known and had, of which Tithes at that time were an undoubted part, but expresses not them, nor any ground of them; much less was the Mosaic Law the ground, and all the ground. What meant you to affirm an untruth, where it is so easy to find you out? The Tithing-table of England is a Book I never saw; and you have not seen this seven years, that in it the Mosaic Law should be the only ground, is incredible; and if it should prove true, either you have a very good memorie, or write at random, true or false at a venture.

But be this so, they pleaded the Mosaic, and that only; yet all the Mosaic Law is not Ceremonial; Tithes may be morally due out of the Mosaic Law: and if so, for what you have demonstrated to the contrary, this may have pleaded right. But that we have done with; suppose the ground of the Plea (whatever it was) to be naught; yet it follows not that the obeyers of that Council acted upon those grounds; I have not found any certain evidence of such a thing; and the Lawes about Woodland, &c. the prevailing customs in so many places about the manner of Tithing, cutting the Minister short of a precise Tenth, are evidences that the Divine Right of Tithes was not so much regarded by the Donors and Confirmers of them.

Yet again some Priests so pleaded for them, and people to give them; will the Donation therefore fall to the ground? frame it then into a general rule. All those deeds of gift which are granted upon a mistaken per-

swation, are *ipso facto* void and of no force. Do you not see this a manifest untruth? power to give, and power to receive, will make conveyances valid, be the principles moving thereto what they will: Sh you have dealt in this Argument unfaithfully with Authors, uncharitably, falsely, and dishonorably with the Churches of God; and all most apparently to effect nothing by it when you have done.

P. 8.

But Tithes are a Popish thing; and we have covenanted against Popish Innovations. So you speak, and so you write, God give the people hearts to make conscience of their Covenant. We should have been glad to have seen this prayer answered sooner; yet it will be better then worse, if known. But then Tithes must kick away among Popish Innovations; if an Innovation, 'tis a pretty ancient one; but how appeared it to be a Popish one, a chief Relique of Popery? have you consulted with any about the judgment of Popish Writers? I am confident you have not. Never did I find men talk so peremptorily of the things they knew not, till I met with men of your temper. Indeed Neighbour, sedulous engagements make Professors do things sadly; to the blessing of our Holy Name thereupon them. Why? the Popish Divines are generally against the Divine Right of Tithes. So Bellarmine, and he affirms this all the Schoolmen are on his side. Hear what Rives says, *Baronius comminatus Pontificiarum Theologorum sententia desertit*: Baronius alone for the Divine Right of Tithes among the Popish Divines. So Capellus; *Plerique si non omnes Ecclesie Patristice Doctores & Theologi*; the most, if not all, the Doctors and Divines of the Popish Church goe against the Divine Right of Tithes; and no wonder, when the *Minister* party (their chief Divines) did, and doe such so great a sweetness from them by drawing them to their debt, which the divine right would have conveyed to other mens doors. Whether Donations were Popish; or no, by this you may plainly see: That allegations were Popish; your self acknowledge; antiquitie doth not clear it from Iniquitie, and I fear eternitie will not; they led upon the stipend *per se*, but did the work *per Vicarium*, and slung him the bone after they had picked off the meat. Be it for ever the brand of that Religion that Popery began this: And may this shame once be wiped off from our Reformation, that we have, and do continue in it.

P. 7.

De Clericis l.

l. c. 25.

P. 9.

Lastly, Though I finde it not in express terms in your writing, yet I suppose it is that you aim at, when you tell us the King in his death-bed gave it to the Priests that then were: And with others it is a principal main exception against the deed of gift, that it was not to such persons as we, but to Popish Priests.

P. 10.

That's not so, *Deo & Ecclesie* do the usual Grants run, to God and the Church. The errors were personal, and die with the person, the next being free from his Predecessors fault, will not be liable to his punishment: Yet a sober adversary will not say that all the Ministers, even in communion with Rome, when Tithes were first given, were Papists; yet if they were, suppose a gift be given to the Church of Staplehurst, and let the present Minister be *Arian* or *Socinian*, this mans heretic will not make the next Incumbent

beir, a sound Orthodox Teacher, uncabable of the gift; for the gift was to the Church, and the error was the man. So it is here.

But suppose the giver intended this gift that *Arianism* and *Socinianism* should be sown among Gospel-truths, as tares among wheat. The use does not appear to be so here; but admit it, still the whole grant be void because some one use of it is found unlawful? why then God hath blotted these had uses out of the dead, the rest remain, and as much need there is the gift should remain, to carry on the still continuing uses as ever, when they were all supposed good. Yes, it may charitably be supposed, that those very devout Donors, if they lived now, would blot out such sinful uses with their own hands, if they should know them displeasing to God, who therefore pur them in because they thought them pleasing. If this will not serve mens turn, but the deed, because of some uses impossible to be fulfilled, appearing now unlawful, is to be accounted void as to all the rest. It will then return into the hand of Kings and Princes again (to the present Landlords and Tenants it cannot, whose it never was) and they have confirm'd it by several Acts since the dayes of Reformation, un-to reformed Ministers, as such, what was at first given to *Papish Priests*, as such (if yet it were so.) So if this be a flaw, it is made by those, who, if any men on earth, have power to heal it.

And yet I doubt not, but as great matters as can be found in those deeds of gift we speak of, will be found as well in most ancient conveyances, especially of publick charity; either *Papish* reasons of the Dedication (*pro remissione animarum*, as well elsewhere (as here) or *Papish* uses of the thing dedicated: Yes, in most old Wills of any that died any thing wealthy, we shall finde something that favour'd of the ignorant devotion of those superstitious times. And why should this be an Exception against our Treaure only, which is against no mans else, would be enquir'd into; unless this be it, that Ministers of all men are the only fit persons to be made a prey of, who have more reason to defend themselves against this plea, then any sort of persons whatsoever under the same condition. In that those gifts designed in part to such unlawful uses, were given to God and his Church, not to the person of any man: Now, though what is given to God for unlawful uses, may, and must be taken from those uses, and applied to other; yet from God and his Church they cannot; no man can so firmly call that his own which is given him, as God does that which is given to him; and to God the things that are Gods, never to be alienated more.

Num. 16. 38.

The Conclusion.

Your Book I have done with: If any strength of reason hath escaped careful search, I am sorry for it; I hope none hath. If in any thing I have mistaken your minde, I shall be willing to be rectified: whether my Reply be insufficient, or full, judge you, but do it as an humble meek-spirited Christian should do: Let not my factious engagement to bear up a party, nor vain-glorious desire to preserve the credit of your Book you have appear'd to the world in, nor yet any scornful resolutions of pride,

N a

disdaining

disdaining instruction from a man so much younger then your selfe: Let not these, nor any thing else pervert a right judgment in you. Repentations are hard things, even to godly people; yet a greater man then either you or I, is more famous for Books of that nature, then for almost any other that he hath written; yet many of his writings against the *Pelagians* are choise pieces too. Therefore pray remember, that all error about Gods Truths is sinful, the knowledge of the truth being as well commanded us, as obedience to it; and those errors are most especially sinful, which are about matters of practice; for they necessarily deale the whole man, and annoy others: And of these, if any more then others, they that consider those sinews of society which unite men in bodies together; such as make us prey upon one anothers goods, unfairly break serious and frequent promises, and then say all manner of evil falsely of those we have thus injur'd; disdain them if they be younger then our selves; require great renderness with highest contumely, and mock that patience that would faine live at peace with us, put what we please into their mouths to make them ridiculous; proclaime words well meant, necessarily spoken, if but liable to any misconstruction, concealing what would clear the suspicion, to make them odious; resolve after all to have nothing to doe with them, and stir up the Saints to doe the like. All this hath your error been fruitful in unto very unkind practices against me: say now another such principle of error, to produce such practices towards others, and you will not be fit to be either Elder or member of a Church, nor yet to live in a society of men. If now you should adde obstinacie to all this, how sad will your account be! I pray doe not; and oh that any thing I could do might mollifie you! the Judge is at the door. Shall I be forced to write that to you which we are wont to speak to common profane persons to bring them to repentance? Nay, *lee the love of Christ constrain you*: you are an aged disciple, however of late years sadly misled, and misleading others. Why should the many palpable sins in this matter, which none can open his mouth for, and your best friends are ashamed of, stand upon Record to the ruine of soules? the Blasphemies, Hefesies, Ambitions, Covetousness, Covenant-breaking, Inconstancie, Unpeaceableness, Hellish railings, and most bitter, yet false accusations, one against another, which the Professors of this age are notoriously guilty of, have hardened multitudes of profane ones, and sent them by troops into hell. Have compassion on your own soules; have compassion on the soules of many others, whose ruine, such language and such dealings doe most visibly endanger: The Lord deliver profane ones from imitating you in that which you stir up Saints to imitate you in. As for me, your unfaithful dealing with me cannot ruine my estate, nor your reproaches wound my reputation among them that know my life, to be neither covetous nor revengful: And, as I am most assured I am set here of God for the good of this people, so I am most resolved to continue in the Lords work to the end; for which I beg his assistance, and in which I wait for his powerful presence unto much success in my undertakings for the soules of those under my care; and I am most confident in the help of God, that your and all mens oppositions, whoever they be, will be as fruitless

first at their own wounds; be who fight against God; and in this hope and strength of assurance I rest.

In the mean time as to what concerns you, I would heartily advise you to examine once again before you die, with all serious humble self-denying industry, those principles which have led you to so high an opposition against your Brethren, in these last years of your life. Lay aside your endeavours to support the *Arminian* cause; all your skill cannot add to what others have said for it before you; your attempts that way will but render you laughter at by some, and just cause for your arrogance by others. Look home as you draw to your long home; let before your eyes the many plain Scriptures against division, and then compare them faithfully with those Scriptures you suppose call you to it: the exceptions from the general Rule of Unity had need be as plain as the Rule it self is; you know what miseries have followed, not onely to others good and bad; the good discouraged, and the bad hardened, but even to your selves; for one added to your assemblies how many broken off, some of which prime leading men; you that have broken others, how hath God broken you? What vexation it hath created you to keep your own in Unity; what heart-breaking it is to see such Devilish Doctrines, and practices broke out of the camp of your Friend, your own heart knows best; the little success your way had in its first entrance into the world, to disturb and disgrace the Reformation in *Germany*, what fearful sins it broke out into, and what a shameful end it had, you have heard of. Now in these last dayes it hath removed it tears into *England*, and for a time bore a great sway; such men almost the onely employed men in places of service and gaine in Army, Navy, everywhere: it now is in its declining (pardon the confidence of the word) the fearful sins we see dayly, and I doubt not but we shall see the shameful end too, though I hope not with that severity of the State upon you. God restraining you from such outrageous attempts against the civil peace. He thinks this should be looked upon as a seasonable admonition from God, to consider your wayes; that you may be sure this sad unprosperous path is yet of Gods chalking out to you. Show me one instance of a truth of Gods, that hath had the like success, once and again: it was not so with the Reformation of Religion at that time attempted in *Germany*; it is not so with our Reformation here, though checked by manifold hinderances, yet it goes on, and waxes onely a time of healing among dissenting Brethren, to Crown and compleat it; and I am most assured they, whose pride and faction hinders this (where principles are not hard to be reconciled) shall bear their blame, and that evidently before men, who ever they be; it never fell out with any truth thus as 'tis with your cause, never since the world stood. Consider your wayes; you had need have a command as clear as any is in all Scripture, to secure you in such unprosperous paths, from the fear of Gods fighting against you.

If yet having done this work of trying your wayes with all serious conscientious care, you find cause to settle in your received persuasion and practice: let me then advise again, and request of you to believe of us, that we are men that desire in all things to keep a good conscience, both towards

God and towards men; that we do not willfully shut our eyes against any known truth, nor resist any known duty; we speak our very hearts after much diligent search, and do not dissimble; we tell you that if nowhere appears to us, where God hath cast our Believers Infants, from that special covenant they were once received into, and from that Church membership that flows from thence; yea, when we suppose the evidences for the contrary are full, and not only nor yet soundly answered by any, but not answerable, we in this speak our very mind: And we desire you to believe us, when we profess our selves amazed to see what miserable shifts you are put to establish the Foundations of the contrary side; it grieves us to see some of you for this end, to revive *Pelagianism*, by denying original sin (yet *Pelagius* durst not deny Infant baptism for all that, though often put to it. *Aug.* tells us what would have become of him, if he had, he would have been in danger of mens spile and Womens Scandals if he had; Christian ears could not endure such a thing) to see your self and many others of you to hold original sin, universally remitted to all mankind by a general Covenant; strange this to us that there should be a Covenant remitting sinnes, which hath no condition on mans side; and that all the damned should have one sin remitted to them, when they have none else; the very best of you seem to us, to be left to sad plunges by denying Infants the benefit of our special Covenant, who with us and you hold original sin, and with us against you deny its universal Remission, when they know not what to say concerning the hope of any Infants salvation, but leave them to God, that is in effect contentedly give them all up to Hell. That distinction of Spiritual promises to the Spiritual seed, only Fleishly promises to the Fleishly seed, is verily to us an amazeement; it overturns the Foundations of Divinity; we verily believe that the same thing that gives us a Covenant Title to the Kingdom of Heaven, gives us a Covenant Title to a piece of bread; that Spiritual and temporal blessings dispensed by way of promise, to a particular person flow from one and the same Covenant; that his Godliness hath the promise of this life as well as of that which is to come; that God puts them both together in the Covenant with *Abraham* and his Seed; that I will be their God is exceedingly more then I will give them the Land of *Canaan*: that God did not mocke the Servant among the *Jews* and the *Proselytes*, when he gave circumcision as a sign between them and him, when he intended that on his part it should signify nothing: that God would never make man a debtor to him in the sign of the mutual Covenant, who by the same Covenant and sign of would make himself a debtor of nothing to man; that unbelief would never have kept the *Jews*, whose carcases fell in the wilderness, from entering into the Land of *Canaan* and Idolatry with other sins would never have cast them out again, if *Canaan* had belonged unto them, merely as the Fleishly Seed of *Abraham*: if the same Faith which was the condition of the Heavenly *Canaan*, were not also the condition of the Earthly: that *Abraham* is in vain made a pattern of justification to all Nations, if what was done in him was singular, and rested in his person; if circumcision were a seal of the Righteousness of Faith to him, and to him only; we conceive the Apostle excludes such phancies in his own expresse

*Timetis dicere
non Baptizemur,
ne non solum
facies vestra
spuim inficiantur
vitorum,
verum etiam
Capita Sanda-
lis muliercularum
comminuantur.* *Aug.*
contra Julianum
lib. 3. c. 5.
*Non lavacrum
regenerationis
& remissionis
peccatorum
audient negare,
ne hoc
Christiana
aures ferre non
possint.* 2. de
peccat. origin.
1 *Tim.* 4. 8.
Gen. 17. 7, 8, 10.
Gal. 3. 3.

19.

Rom. 4. 11.

express words perceived that he might be a Father; and what is this but he might be a Father? he explains himself that righteousness might be imputed to them also. I would hazard any ill consequence might be found of a man from the Doctrine of Infant Baptism; then we are any one of these things; they are verily in our eyes monstrous imaginations of dreaming men; all of them; so it seems a certain truth, that spiritual promises to the fleshly Seed of Abraham were a part and the chiefest of Abrahams blessing; as that this is done on the Gentils through Jesus Christ; that if the root be holy, so are the branches, is a truth universally verified of Jew & Gentile; & where God put our Childrens names into the Sealed Indenture of Covenant between us to him, we dare not be so blaspheinous to God, as unnatural to our Children, as to blot out their names again; these are our very thoughts: we shut our eyes against a light, but have weighed what is alledged on the behalf of your cause in the balance of our most impartial judgement, according to Scripture, and find it light: and our Request to you is, if you must suppose us to erre in judgement (the Lord reveal evn this unto you) that yet where our conversation is orderly accorded to the Gospel; you would spare our hearts, which are to be judged by a severer one that knows their better and their secrets; then you do. That you would remember what benefit your self once received in your most zealous following of such as we are, and would conclude it possible, that others may have the same benefit in their conscientious attendance upon us now; and so our of gratitude, charity, and wisdom to stand out of the way of that cause, which is wont to be the portion of them that heave as their burden some stone; who hinder the Preaching of the word to ignorant extant ones, that they may be saved, the objects of so much pity and compassion; and if it be their stubbornness that they will not follow your assemblies, yet let them be brought to Christ anywhere, and do you rejoyce with us at such powerful experiences of mercy, and do not envy us; why should you seek to destroy us by Petitions, Remonstrances, Practices? Do not do so, it will not turn to your account; if you must divide, carry it no further than needs must, if you cannot have to do with us, as much as it were comfortable that you did; and we take it to be your duty; yet resolve not to have nothing to do with us: nothing is a hard word, and Actions suitable to such words are harder; no dealing was high arrogance in the Jews, even against Samaritans; Christ sets us there a more merciful Example; there is love, pity, Prayer, doing good, speaking well, furthering one another in what we agree, debating what we differ in with ingenuous opennesse, humility, and meekenesse; if we must speak amiss of wayes, be we tender how we then nothing to speak amiss of persons; in a great sumptome of an high inward Fever is a do. black fowl rough tongue. David and Paul both fetch the Character of the man who hath no fear of God before his eyes, in a great part from the viciousnesse of the tongue; the Spear broke Christs side, but reproach broke his heart; among the grieving sin to the holy Spirit of God we find bitterness and evil speaking; raising accusations are uncomely for Angels; fit only for raging waves of the Sea, that foame out their own shame, to whom is reserved the blacknesse of darkness for ever. Remember Neighbour, that

Gal. 3.14.

Rom. 11.16.

Rom. 2.16.

Zech. 1.16.

1 Thes. 2.16.

P. 6.

Jo. 4.9.

These are better

Rom. 3.13, 14.

P. 64.20.

Eph. 4.30, 31.

Jude 9. 13, 14.

a day

a day of Execution of Judgement is a coming for God to convince men of hard Speeches as of hard deeds, who will not be convinced of them sooner; but of you my Neighbour I shall yet hope better things, and shall be glad to see them by the humble acknowledgements of the many such your Book is filled with.

As for mocking in matters that concern Salvation, and between persons whose age and quality of life should make more serious in common things, for you and I to get up into the seat of the Scorners, I cannot think of it without terror how lamentable it is; Oh do not so any more; remember Christ weeping and sobbing over Jerusalem almost every word he speaks do not in all things fulfil the Prophecy; Oh that it were fulfilled upon you in nothing! Do you remember what sin cost Christ for the Elect? and what sin must cost the Reprobates in Hell? and can you make a mock of sin? any sin? Plead not Elisha's Example to Baals Priests; we are not the men, neither have you the Spirit; you will not, I hope, do that which follows in the History: *The Lord soften my hard heart more and more, give me Jeremics Fountain of waters, that I may weep day and night for my own, for yours, and for others sins.* This sure is the true Ministers temper; With a mocking Spirit we shall Preach proudly, but with a weeping Spirit we shall Preach compassionately; and you may judge which is like to be the more successful. And that laboured so abundantly; and whose Labours were crowned so plentifully, was one that ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.

It was thought by the Apostle a piercing word, how wastest thou not charitably; ymo almost could not have been spoken to the shame of a Christian; let us mend the Characters of charity, and write them out in the hearts; and if our debates be not then ended, they will be bounded; wherein our attainments are one, let us walk by the same Rule, mind the same things; and this will be a means by Prayer, and the conscientious Study of Scripture with humble conferences; according to Scripture, to have God reveal to us wherein we agree not; Alienation of affections makes controversies endless more then the Intricacy of them; where Judgment rents a little Christs seamless Coat, Passion and self Interest pursue the breach, and tear it from top to bottom: yea, most common it is that what Passion begins, reason must defend and make good; let us therefore walk together so far as we may, till we must needs part; then with friendly seriousness debate the rest; and let a Scripture Spirit sway in our resolutions, not the Spirit of man which is proud and willful; and then I am persuaded our much desired Peace may return to us.

To this ayme I direct these Papers of mine, humbly beseeching God, the Giver of that Wisdom which is pure and Peaceable, to prosper them, to accomplish what they are directed to; to instruct the ignorant, convince the gainers, confirm the sound-minded; to mollify sharp and eager Adversaries, not exasperate them; and then it will not grieve me, nor offend others that so unworthy a name as mine is hath been in Print.

READER,

There should have been inserted p. 26. lin. 25. these few things following; which though they were omitted in that place by the Printers oversight: I desire thou wouldst take notice of them here; they are as followeth.

This gives a fair reason against the morality of a tenth of the tenth, if it was paid to the High Priest, for himself alone, & the other Priests shared with the Levite in the rest: but in case the tenth of tenth was paid to the High Priest for himself, & his fellow Priests; so make them sharers with him, not with the Levites, as is thought by some out of Neh. 10. 38. Then somewhat more is to be said, why the tenth of tenth belongs not to our present inquiry, as being confessedly Ceremonial, whereas the Levites tenth was not. The reasons of this I humbly conceive, are from the great difference in the Officers under the Law, from the Officers under the Gospel, in point of,

1. Number. Then the Priests, the Sons of Aaron were a small part of their Brethren the children of Levi; and therefore were well provided for by a tenth out of the tenth: Whereas it is otherwise under the Gospel comparing Bishops and Deacons together; they began with twelve on one side (though we exclude the seventy) and seven on the other side; and in all ages so it continued, Deacons fewer then the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments; a tenth therefore of a tenth cannot be observed now.

2. Service. The difference between the Priests service and the Levites being wholly Ceremonial; consequently the difference of maintenance, which in part was grounded on a different service (the Priests not being a tenth part of the Levites, though they had a tenth part of their provision) must be Ceremonial too; if the Priest prayed for, and blessed the people so did the Levite. Neh. 9. 4, 5. If the Priest taught the people out of the Law, so did the Levite; a Chro. 17. 8, 9. If the Priest executed Judgement in matters of the Lord, so did the Levite. 9 Chro. 19. 8, 11. Take away Sacrifices and what was annexed to them, and their service are altogether the same: but so it is not between Bishop and Deacon under the Gospel (paid in to God; the summe is, the Command of a tenth from the people might be moral, yet the distribution of it) between Priests and Levites in part civil, referring to their different numbers; in part Ceremonial, referring to their different services; so the Reverend Master Tho. Hookers conclusion, upon the supposed morality of a tenth will not follow (Ergo the Ministers must have the tenth of a Tenth.)

Survey of
discip. p.
2. p. 31.

This foundation removed out of the way; the enforcement of this reason added by that excellent holy man falls to the ground with it. It is true (then Ministers must receive from them happily, who were never taught by them; as the Levites who taught in the particular Synagogues paid to the Priest, and to the Levites too, who administered in Jerusalem) this is supposed contrary to Gal. 6. 6; but indeed is not for cases may be where in they that are not taught are bound to contribute to a Teacher as well as they that are: Master Hooker might have observed one case at home in the Preachers to the convert Indians; we are all both Englands; New and Old, their Debtors of an honorable maintenance, though they never Teach us. They that do common service for all (as the Priests at Jerusalem did for the Levites as well as for the rest of the Jews) deserve a common provision from all. But however to put all out of doubt, as there is no such distribution of Offices for the people, as a part of the peoples service to be performed by some Officers, where the people live; and a part by other Officers elsewhere; so there is not that distribution of payments; but he that is taught communicates to him that Teaches, and

parts of tithes that are all hands are laid aside. That I may at once reply
 to what is offered by the most reverend man of God, against the morality of a tenth
 37. *Gen. 37. The first Plea is, that he opposes; but the second he is a fast friend to;* take a
 4. p. 16. brief answer to his first reason also or what is above is to his second; it runs thus,
 this (the Gospel way) is raised out of all good things the person that it tithes
 hath; but those Tithes in the old Testament were out of the seed of the Land, fruit
 of the Trees, or of the herd of the Flock. Lev. 27. 30, 31, 32. Deut. 14. 22, 23. the
 place in Deut. speaks of Tithes for Feasts and Sacrifices; but let that pass; to
 the Argument; this may be considered of that, setting that question aside, whether
 personal Tithes were not due under the Law as well as predial; Doctor Burgess
 hath offered something for it, and neither of these Scriptures say any thing against
 Gen. 28. in. This I say, which is clear, that Jacobs vow was of all; and Abrahams pay-
 42. & 14. ment was of all, and of spoiles (personal Tithes) by name; if the Apostles dare ob-
 11. ject, how be duly rendred under the Law; Tithes are a right current; the measure
 Hebr. 7. 4. of them is not therefore to be taken thence, but from the evidences that are before, if
 Moses Law do not mention personal Tithes; 'tis enough if they do not renounce them;
 their due esse otherwise is stated already, if Abraham and Jacob did what they
 did by Law, of which hereafter. Here then is a wonderful agreement between
 Law and Gospel, of all sayes Abraham and Jacob, in all good things sayes Paul.
 This with all tender respect to the never dying memory of that blessed man, con-
 cerning what in this debate his reasons seem to be defective in.

E R R A T A.

P. 2. lin. 24. for also inquired, read also will inquire, in Marg. 19. r. 14. l. 26. put
 with, r. put off with. p. 3. l. 3. offer, r. offered. p. 8. l. 3. yet see what he prints, p. 10.
 l. 10. shamey, slander. p. 13. in m. Act. 4. 5. r. Am. 4. 4, 5. Act. 19. r. Act. 29. p. 13. l.

37. strong, r. strengthen. p. 17. Lantepemst, by, r. then. p. 18. { Law { Divine
 { Law { Divine. { Free-gift { Humane,
 { Free-gift { Humane. p. 20. in m. Gen. 32. r. 33. p. 21. l. 12. dele and and r. p.
 23. l. 4. to be verified a mystery, r. to be verified in a mystery. l. 31. that, r. see. p.
 24. l. 16. with, r. tenth. p. 26. in m. Num. 18. 18. r. 28. & Deut. 14. 22, 26. p. 27. in m.
 15. 18. r. 26. l. 20. how, r. now. p. 30. l. 12. bring, r. being. p. 31. li. 27. things, read
 times. p. 34. l. 5. I think justly, r. I fear so too. p. 35. in m. Act. 14. 16. r. 13. p. 38. in
 m. Priest. Catech. r. practice. Catech. l. 4. a Brasse Farthing, a broken a Brasse Far-
 thing. p. 41. in m. r. 9. vi. l. 2. Law, r. Law. p. 42. l. 32. if, r. is. p. 46. l. 18. convers-
 red, r. required. p. 48. l. 31. there, r. these. p. 49. 139. by, r. abide. p. 51. l. 34. watches,
 r. coaches. p. 54. l. 2. charge, r. change. p. 55. l. 1. ult. now, r. no. p. 56. in m. Luc. 10. 140.
 r. 17. p. 60. l. 5. a fine for his Sons, r. the Priests a fine; for Tithing, r. threaten-
 ning. p. 62. l. 27. this, r. thy. p. 64. l. 26. l. 49. 13. r. 23. p. 65. l. 12. but, r. you. l. 35. af-
 ter rules adde bett. p. 66. l. 16. against, r. of in m. Mark. 7. Math. p. 67. in m. Math.
 27. r. 26. p. 69. l. 12. after prayed against by the Church, r. Tim. 2. 2. adde this
 that we find; we find also, an appeal to them in a case purely of Religion;
 Act. 23. 18. 19. and this supposes a power in these cases; yea Paul himself pro-
 tests it, v. 10. when I ought. l. 34. of, r. with. p. 70. l. 4. why should this where
 say, r. why this where should say. l. penult. came, r. come. p. 71. l. 5. a fine for that,
 r. this. p. 77. l. 10. they & their, r. he & his. p. 78. l. 35. minded, r. minded. p. 84. l. 10.
 dele therefore. p. 85. l. 35. after letting adde our. p. 86. l. 29. in, r. in. l. 30. after was
 adde not. p. 94. l. 15. it was possible, r. was it possible. p. 97. l. 47. they, r. they.
 p. 100. l. 14. scandal, r. scandal. l. 28. after sign of adde it. p. 101. in m. Pl. 60. 20. r. 69.
 20. p. 102. lin. 1. after men adde as well. lin. 26. mend the re mind him, in the
 heart, read in our hearts.

ther; and no good subject can from the supposition of the one, infer the denial of the other. It is the very Argument upon which Papists ground the Exemption of their Priests from the Jurisdiction of Princes. Pray do you forbear it, lest you make your self as bad a subject as they.

P. 17. 13.

9 If it be Civil, or Common, it may be done, or left undone, till the Magistrate compell it; and then it must be done. What strange work have we here! a Civil, or common thing; who would joyn those two words together to signifie one and the same thing; but my Neighbour? especially when the common thing is explained by a thing indifferent, which may be done or undone, till the stamp of Authority set upon it make it necessary? What are all Civil things such? that Ministers maintenance must needs be such among the rest, if it come under a civil Sanction? Wellfare your heart however, when you acknowledge that the stamp of the Magistrates power added to indifferent things, makes them necessary. But hath the Magistrate no power to set the stamp of his Authority upon things necessary? Are all things that come within his reach such as may be done or left undone, till he make Lawes about them? I had thought that the great work of the Judicial Lawes was to be a fence about the Moral; and that the main work of Magistrates was *To be a restraint to evil doers, and to be for the praise of them that do well;* the Rule of which doing well or ill is the Law of God: The best excuse for these things, is, that you wrote at random, and intended not what you wrote.

And that will further appear, if we take notice that this very foul mistake does most dangerously wound that very cause for which it is asserted. For, is it not your Doctrine, That the determinate proportion of what is to be paid to Ministers, is nowhere commanded by God: if so, then though a maintenance is due; yet this, or that proportion is indifferent; may be done, or left undone, and another chosen. Will you now the resolution of this *quæstio* according to your very rule, belong to the Magistrate, as a thing indifferent? The Consequence then to be heeded, will not be, if Magistrates please; Christs Ministers shall have a maintenance; and if they so please, they shall have none: But if Magistrates please, they shall have this maintenance in particular; or if this please not, another; the determination of which indifferent thing (supposing it so to be) some men think will better become a faithful upright Magistrate, then the very best of our people, who are the persons must pay what is so determined. I hope we shall hear of this Argument no more, which is apparently false, and destructive to civil government in the proposition, and in the consequence cuts the throat of that cause for which it is produced. In the last place, Scriptures are produced against compulsion, as the

P. 11.

they which hinder the Gospel, and make it chargeable: to which
they are obliged: 1. Cor. 9. 14. 2. Cor. 9. 7. and 2. Cor.

When *Paul* speaks of the Magistrates power in making
Laws; but of the Ministers duty of receiving his maintenance due
any how from a people, whether by a Law of man, or by the free
contribution of the people: you self acknowledge they do immedi-
ately concern this, & so are not at all material to our present question;
for they are two things: The placing of a man right by Law, which
we look for now: And the recovery of those rights so stated by
him whose they are. They are just Laws by which a Landlord
may recover his rent of his Tenant, yet there may be many cases
wherein the Landlord may abuse his power in the use of it, to the
frustration of the Gospel: so is it in an higher degree here. Yet
be that would make *Pauls* example, even as himself commends it

P. 23.

to the Elders of *Ephesus*, who were not, so far as we know, extra-
ordinarily gifted, nor did receive help from other Churches, so far as
we know: both which are considerable differences in *Pauls* exam-
ple) had need consider well that he make the cases alike. He must

a perpetually

suppose a people newly brought to the Faith of Christ, a Minister
contending with false Apostles, whose glory it was in speech freely:
wherefore Neighbour, That is the character of a true Apostle
to preach, saying nothing, and as it is glory, and a Minister ena-
bled by skill in an ingenuous Trade to earn his bread without de-
stroying the bodily health. Where no public maintenance is crea-

Acts 20. 34. 35.

ed yet apart for this Service, which is the Ministers property, and
no man else: this is our case, but was not *Pauls*, nor the Elders of
Ephesus. We cover no mans silver, but allow every man to take a

2 Cor. 11. 12.

moderate share in what is ours, and allow it not contented with-
out grudging it them: For say, how God knoweth my necessity. Whe-
ther this be not beyond *Pauls* Example, for others judge: And
yet then, when the cases are made the same (if it were possible)

P. 9.
Acts 18. 3.

what would *Pauls* Example bid us? only thus much, to deny
our selves in the possession and use of our Right upon weighty con-
siderations for the Gospel sake: not in the right and title, that was
eagerly stood to by him, and not denied by them. Now it hath
been the matter of Right hath been in question between you and I,
not the exacting of the use of this right where it is acknowledged;
and this is none of mine, the Apostle durst not give up his right to a
maintenance, neither dare I to this.

Add as the Close of all, that whereas 2. Cor. 9. and 2. Cor. 9. are
chiefly alleged against a constrained maintenance by the Civil Ma-
gistrates Authority: they doe directly belong to provisions for the
poor, only by consequence, if at all (of that above) provisions for
Ministers. Now if the Magistrate determine any thing, as to us

whom

where the place concern not but by consequence, you obey not ; whereas if the Magistrate determine any thing, as to the peace, of whom the places alledged speak directly, you resist not, so far as ever I heard, none of you. Now what perfection is this ? Consider your ways.

I have with most punctual exactness considered all that hath the least shew of a reason against the Power and Duty of the Civil Magistrate. The Lord help you to a clear understanding, to discern the exceeding emptiness and insufficiency of them ; and to an humble heart, that you may be willing upon so plain and full a discovery, to lay aside your Error. The matter is of very great weight ; and obstinacy in any evil ; to persevere the reputation of our wisdom, will be an infamous crime in any Cause ; much more in this.

As a Conclusion of this Discourse, I shall add some general Answers to other mens Exceptions against the Magistrate making Laws in matters of Religion ; and then I shall have done with the second Plea.

The first Plea is the difficulty of defining to the Magistrate his Jurisdiction in such matters. All yield some infirmities of mind, to the power of Truth allowable ; as well as some infirmities of heart, as to the practice of Duty : And where shall we look for wisdom, who such a difficulty now more often under the Old Testament ? But Christ given us the Gospel to declare the Truths of God, or to make them more illustrious ? At least fix there ; this at first sight is reasonable, let the bounds that they were, and matters natural and perpetual, be now

Why we not agree thus far, to restrain men from transgressing under their own consciences which must love them, and from doing damage to the Spirit of Grace : keep men from committing that sin which shall never be forgiven them ? 3. Can we punish an Adulterer with death, and yet tolerate those filthy Principles through which he was led to commit it ? 4. If men hold principles formally destructive of Civil Government, shall these by that Law be tolerated, by which Civil Government is upheld ? For say what I will, though I am not so self-contentedly cruel as to will nothing tolerated ; yet I cannot but tremble at an Act of Toleration, for any thing that is evil : For what is that but to make a State allowance for men to sin ? Should I hear of an Act of Toleration to bar an obnoxious (ye, I should think it an evil) ready to be sanctioned, yet I would not have every such a one added to the trial of our publick Justice for it. If any thing be to be decided in the matter of Toleration, it were more proper to declare severely what they will not tolerate, then what they will.

But

But this Conscience is a tender thing, and may not be forced; Religion is not to be beaten, but perswaded into men; that's the way of the *Gentiles* Conversion Prophesied of. Why? *Lawes* *Pe-* Gen. 9. 27.
 huck have for their end to revenge the evil done, by executing wrath upon the doer, to the terror of others, the recovery and salvation of the offender, onely so far as is consistent with this. So in other matters, why not so here too? Must Conscience be made a sacred *Asylum* for all manner of villainies to have a refuge to, and there Rom. 13. 4.
 denie the justest Lawes that are made against them? *Then shalt take him from the Altar that he die*, saith God. Every Malefactor may escape thus.

But are *Popal Lawes* no helps towards the conversion of him that suffers them, *unadvisedly* a sure God whips men so often into pure Consciences by several chastisements. A power indeed there goes with the Rod; but it would be a power alone if the Rod did nothing: Nor so fitly sure is chastising children, so often commanded unto Parents. All other Parents come to their children with a Rod heavenly and earthly; and they suppose and finde it to their childrens good profit. Shall the publick Father alone either have no Rod, or his an unprofitable one? Rods do not change the heart, but they may awaken the secure quiet sinner unto a consideration of his wayes; they may soften the hearts stubbornness, though then in another hand must set to the seal when the wax is softened: Eccl. 7. 14.
 when they doe least, they may restrain the impudent profusion of sin, though they cannot remove the love of sin in the heart. Lawes against Murder and Adultery cannot take away the inclination of the heart to such sins; yet are they not in vain. We cannot by law change a sinners heart; but we may change his place by Law: Our *Our Brethren in New-England* can baptize them whom they cannot reclaim. We cannot by Law change mens hearts; yet we may by Law encourage them who by Christ are employed for that very purpose, and remove from them those that loose and pervert them; and this will go very far towards the changing of their hearts. If conscience be a thing that cannot be forced; why doe we make Lawes about it? If Lawes are good, they may direct, warn, draw a bad conscience; and it were not much harm if they could force it; better is a forced good, then a free evil: If Lawes are bad, what fear we; they may discover a bad conscience, but they cannot force the good.

But here is another long Objection: Few men are good and great too. Not many mighty. *Buchanans* message to King James, when he lay upon his death-bed is too true. He was a going to that place whither few Kings would follow him. Will not this rather hazard the persecution of the good conscience, rather than diminish it? Were it not better that known Malefactors should

be spared now, that hereafter if ungracious Magistrates be set up in
 wrath, Gods people may be spared under them? Doubtless a very
 subtil device; and pity that *Herodas* did not wisely foresee what
 the condition of Gods people might be under his Son *Maras*, and
 tolerate Idolaters under his Reign, that so *Maras* might tolerate
 the true worshippers under his. Nay let us enlarge the polittick
 counsel too: If Parents and Masters that are godly, should suffer sin
 in their children and servants, in hopes that the many Parents and
 Masters that are wicked, will doe the like to their children and ser-
 vants that are godly: would it not be a deep designe too? especi-
 ally the good Parents and Masters being so few, and the bad so ma-
 ny? What care doe men take sincere Christians may never feel the
 Crosse? Yet that was one of Christs Legacies to his; it was the Apo-
 stles glory, is that to which all they that will live godly are appointed;
 and the first Christians counted them happy that endured; but with
 us, how effeminate, and worldly, and ambitious a thing is the pro-
 fession of Religion grow'n to be? Grace shall spare sin, but sin hereafter
 may spare grace: Have we this league within us too? or are we sure
 sin will stand to the terms? never look that wicked ones will deale
 so gently with the good conscience as we expect they should. Pa-
 pists never yet gave us any such instances to hope so; and if the wit-
 nesses be not yet slain by them (and far wiser men then I think
 they are not) there is a sea of blood more to be added to what is
 under the Whores skirts already: Pray how long is it since the Lion
 turned Lamb? Blood is an essential Ingredient in the Religion of a
 Papist; and let those who have received the most deadly principles
 that Popery hath in the Decisive part of it already, adde but the o-
 pen profession of Popery; yes, let them but hold the same things
 with other names, and go on with their serpents, vipers, filthy beasts,
 dogs, and such names as these innocent weak ones please to give us,
 the Magistrate in the mean time clapping all sides on the back, only
 holding a sword between them to keep them asunder; and who
 can expect but these two Serps should in time meet in one? and that
 then words should be turned to blows, and we dealt with as those
 noysome creatures we are likened to are wont to be? This they
 would doe, becoming Papists, though they were meeker then they
 are: turn the lamb into a wolf, and it will devour flesh, though it do not
 now. And if we tolerate not the name of Popery, it will be finally
 to our relief, if we tolerate the thing; names shed no blood. Look
 to it therefore ye Magistrates supreme and subordinate, drive away
 those blood-sucking Leeches out of the Nation, under what favour or
 disguise soever you finde them. Let not these frogs of Egypt creep
 into your life-guard and Bed-chamber. Papists have under every
 government the wed us where they intend to begin: Let not Queen
Abba think to escape when her fellow Jews are massacred.

But

But why should we be enemies to the liberty of men? politicians especially we that are so lately come out of bondage ourselves? what availing is it to breathe men of this precious freedom which is purchased for them by the blood of Christ?

It is so indeed; and if this be such a freedom as is purchased by Christ's blood, we have done, and shall never speak more against men enjoying the sweet benefit of it. But did ever Christ purchase freedom for us from those commands of men that require us to do our duty? did he do so to servants, or children, or wives, that he should be thought to do so to subjects? There were such ignorant and malicious ones that thought so in the Apostles' time too; but Christian freedom was not to be abused so. What, does the grace of the Gospel intend to make us men of Belial, lawless, and without a yoke to believe what we list, and do and speak in matters of Religion what we list? why not a freedom to murder, adultery, treason as well as lèse-majesté, nor as likely that Christ's blood should be shed for these, as for blasphemy against his own person? These are sad reasonings from men of wisdom; the Lord in mercy answer them, that men may once learn the truth of such maxims as these. That it is man's greatest slavery to be free to sin. That government is in vain appointed, if men may do and speak what they please under it. That there is a great difference between execution of justice and persecution. That Christ's blood was shed to make us free to good, not free to evil. That Christianity diminishes not the just rights of any lawful Superiour, nor frees any from a due subjection to the powers over them; as it binds in these things, so it leaves; Saints must be subject, as well as other men. That though God alone make Lawes to binde mens consciences, yet men may guide mens consciences to the obedience of those Lawes, and punish the disobeying person, though they meddle not with his conscience. That it will be no plea allowed at the day of God, in matters of sin, to say, *It was my Conscience*: And if it will not excuse the sinner from Hell, he should not have had such a conscience; much less ought it to be a plea in the day of man, where the penalty is of a lower nature. That it is far better to suffer for doing well, then not to be restrained from doing ill. That Magistrates should have consciences as well as subjects; and if it be according to their conscience to be a terrour to evil doers. (I am sure it should be) why may not they plead this freedom of conscience upon the same ground as evil doers plead it, that they may goe unpunished? If Magistrates omit a known duty, they wound their conscience; if the evil doer (suppose the well doer) suffer under the mistake of Magistrates, his conscience is not presently wounded here: who then should rather of the two be provided for? That a Liberty to obey God without fear of man is a choise mercy, not so a liberty to disobey God. That

1 Pet. 2. 15.

when Magistrates lay more upon men, in matters of Religion, than God hath commanded, there Liberty of Conscience is a Jewel; but where they lay no more than things necessary, not so. When they can say truly, It seems good to the Holy Ghost, no great harm if and to us follow, no not from them. That it is a more fearful thing to fall into the hands of the Living God, than of a mortal man; and that if we did judge our selves, we should not be judged. We know the Story; The Mother, searable and sharp correcting her son, might have prevented her unprofitable weeping for him when she saw him at the Gallows. Therefore, That the allowing every man to worship God peaceably in his own way, becomes them only, that suppose every man may be saved in his own Religion, living orderly, according to the Rules of it; and to such the Faith of Christ owes little: If this were true, it were better be for Mahomet, for his Rules afford greater liberty than Christs do.

But we are as much Hereticks in their eyes, as they are in ours: It appears so indeed by the language they vouchsafe us. But the question is not what either side is named, but how justly. The Prince is as much a Tyrant in the Assassins eyes, as he is a Traitor in the Princes: Strange! that we should not transfer the reason of these things as easily, and with as little scruples to matters of God, as we do to our own.

But such things are contrary to the light of nature; things whereof we speak, are only contrary to revealed light, the light of Scripture. There is a generation that reject this distinction; I hope they will expect no benefit by it. For others, tis much that the gatherer of sticks on the Sabbath day could not finde out this distinction to save himself from stoning with. Have we not as good evidences for the New Testament doctrine, as they had for the old? The Doctrine of the Gospel is revealed sufficiently to damn them that will not believe it; and may not men be punished on earth for blaspheming it, for want of a sufficient Revelation? Take heed, do not make God unrighteous, who taketh vengeance. It is as hard a matter to be assured of that Law of Nature, No woman but one; that it is of God; as it is to be assured of that Law of Scripture, No Mediator but one, that this is of God. Let any man compare the Evidences for both, and he will quickly see this is truth; and yet the adultery of having two wives is justly punished with death. What man can see so much of the Law of Nature written in his own heart, as he may see of it written in Scripture? let him add the help of all the great Masters of Nature that ever wrote in the world. Paul was of our mind in this thing, when he tells us he had not known so but by the Law. And Scripture is clearer in that which is knowable only by revealed light, than it is in that which in part is also knowable by the light of Nature, if in any thing it exceed itself in clearness.

Rom. 7. 7.

True,

True, but men know not Scripture so well as they might, and they must be acquainted with this greater Light, else it will not condemn them. *Not know Scripture?* we know them that seem to be headed for this; they will tell you none know Scripture but they. But what do they not know? Not that there is but one Christ; that we are purchased by the blood of God; that to lye against the Holy Ghost, is a lye against God; &c. We speak not of things doubtfully defined, or of tolerable differences in the less vital parts of Religion: Men here may be ignorant of Scripture, and God forbid we should stir up Magistrates against them, if they would hold peace, blessed and unity; but are they ignorant of such things as these? how dare they say so? *Will God take care for their souls for a sufficient answer?* and in their ignorance will they venture to blaspheme too? May not some *Ranter* with as good Arguments plead that *Adultery* is no sin; and *Loyalty*, that to overthrow all propriety is no sin; and *Traitors*, that to assassinate Magistrates, is no sin? will ignorance excuse him? *They have Moses and the Prophets, let them hear them.* We are under the highest dispensation for the attaining of knowledge, and by it eternal life already: If therefore men hear not these, we may well conclude, *Neither will they be saved though one rise from the dead.*

But these are innocent creatures, hurt no body with their evil; let us to ourselves, and there is none the worse for it. Most false this of the *Ranther* Error; that is, much more of those false enormities ones against the first Principles of the Gospel. Why should God be provoked, and his vengeance brought upon the Nation? Is it not evil, that the Word loses its Authority upon sinners, so their eternal undoing; through the perpetual violence and moans of contradicting men? That Gods worship is visibly and professedly despised with that impudence, as no Turk almost durst do the like? That thousands of well-meaning people are drawn aside, to the hazard of their souls? That mutual evil feelings, estrangements, oppositions, heart-burnings, boiling up the most of a Sute-conscience, prepare for civil Comotions, and letting one anothers blood? That all offices of mutual love are forgotten? The great Gospel-law of Unity broken; and we thus become two fields of slaughter, should be as far from one another, when call'd to assist in any work of mercy for common good, as if we liv'd at a hundred miles distance? *Pray why was Hymenaeus delivered to Satan?* I would they were run out of the terrible you. *What word is this against false Teachers?* Surely Paul was too fully, he was not merciful enough to tender Conscience. *What need all that are in a Cor. against false Teachers?* good men they were for Christ as well as he, only for Heretic and Division too: *Why*

1 Tim. I. 20.
Gal. 5. 12.

To what purpose then my Christian Friend, that wild extravagant discourse of Tyrant Kings, giving away what's none of their own? yet conquest upon a righteous War is a just Title, though William was no Conquerour, held not his Crown by that Title; much lesse does Oliver Protector: *The Beast* Rev. 13. and *the Whore*, c. 17. what come they in for? Do they prove themselves the Beasts off-spring by freely giving their own, and the Whores by taking what is freely given? Remember man, 'tis the Right of Donation is now stood upon, which you reply to. Why should I mind King Henry VIII. suppressing the Popes supremacy and taking it to himself? or our reverend Fathers the Bishops, the Lords Bishops? What's all this to the Title of Free Donation? and what is this better before God think you then the hood &c. This, what? Free Gift? Is this also from that Holy Father the Pope? What have we here to do with Henry the VIII. taking of Personages, with Princes Laws, or Popes workings: Our Flock if Faithful, will be a willing people, they have been so, have freely given; it is not left to the Magistrates pleasure, Princes and people have freely given; what would you have more? the Donation does not confound it self, neither does your confused writing nothing to the purpose confound it.

P. 11.

P. 11.

But we claime it as a free Gift! True, you told us so P. 10. but were sensible it seems of your wild running away from it, in that and the next Page: so now you will return to it; no, not now neither; 'tis a Bears ear, he dares not touch it; then I have no right to it, but as a Rector; be it so as a Rector, I claime it; what is this Doctrine new to you? Ministers are Servants, 2 Cor. 4. 5. but for Jesus sake; and they are Rulers too; their Rule is Ministerial, they have an high merciful end for which they serve, and they Rule by directing and commanding to that way which leads by Gods appointment to this end. Then I dare trust an old (the elder the better Title) Popes Donation, Popes man? their own who were owners of the Land; is it not so in your Plea as your self relate it but three Lines before? Then Christs Ordination: why? we speak now of Free-gift, is not that Christs Ordination? Now being put from your Divine Plea, nor by your reasons, I assure you: but be it so, we now speak of Donation. I pray tell me, what proportion it is but the Free-gift of the Giver? you have told the world twice, 'tis that very thing we speak of, did you ever find it a touch by Christs appointment? why? You have told men but just now we are put off from our Divine Plea; this is to stand, and crouch over us a while, after you have beaten us from that ground, with come hither again if you dare (you see I have ventured however) but pursue your Victory; you see we have taken field again upon another ground that of Free-gift. I pray be not offended, I pray take it in good part, now speak to the business honestly and fairly, and I will not be offended; but this is tire some, though not

P. 12.

Luc. 12. 42.

Hebr. 13. 17, 24.

1 Cor. 16. 16.

1 Tim. 4. 11.

the first time you have exercised my patience, if not by the Law of God; again that? will you never have done conquerings? Not by the Gift of Indulgent Princes? we proclaim it by the Gift of Indulgent Princes and people, and your self have told the world as much for us twice already; what is it you now answer to bar this? but by some old Popish Statute. I tell you we have done with Statutes now, Popish or not Popish: tis Free-gift we speak of. After *Austins* coming into England, tithes were not required, but Free-gift was the only maintenance: man, 'tis that you are now pressed with, Free-gift, and that of Tithes; we prove it from about those very times: watch men blind, and in those dayes could but read a Homily; in those dayes? *Massius*? did they read in the Book of Homilies then? and what if they did, then or since? what's this to Donation? Yet now must they tither turn back again, as it were into Egypt for onions and garlics, then to feed upon *Manna*, the Lords Free-gift. Why, 'tis that very *Manna* we plead for, the Free-gift you speak of. Therefore thus to your Paper. For shame you should not have mentioned such a word, who have not printed it when you pretend to answer it; you might have put it easily into the empty page: But what to my Paper? It was Christs Prerogative to provide for his house, he hath so done, and changed his Ministers wages into a Free-gift, and not Tithes; into a free-gift of Tithes let it pass to now. Twice you have told men so that thus we plead, and do not you yet know it your self? Yet you have not done your wanderings; next come exceptions against Lawes Civil, for the recovering of Tithes; be it a casual reasoning to say, if a Minister may not starve, he may starve. What's this to Free-gift? A Free-gift may be sued for, as in the case of Legacies. Is it not strange (all things considered) well, you are a very considerate man; but what is so strange? that ever National Teachers should desert the Church of Rome, and yet love the *Diana* of Tithes so much. You that have considered all things, tell us but one reason why this should seem strange: But 'tis a Free-gift we love, 'tis that we now stand upon, your *Diana*, if that word please you so well: Rome would not trust Princes with such a thing; and truly it seemeth so, so that this is that the National Teachers mainly want, to be not only Bishops, but Lord Bishops. No, no, oh dispute not against that, that cause will not now trouble you, you have another before you, he changed it into a Free-gift: the very thing we speak of. He left it not to the pleasure of Magistrates, then his faithful Ministers should hardly get a Liveliness; yes, by Free-will Offerings, as well the Magistrate neglecting his duty, as if we suppose him to have none at all. But we trouble not Magistrates now; 'tis the Free-gift we speak of. Then the lying story (a most impudent slander) comes in of me and my Predecessor, of which before. Nothing at all to the Donation for four pages after an Answer to this. Was undertaken.

Reader,

Reader, I relate not all this for the considerableness of what is said by him, or reply'd by me; nor yet to make my self and my Reader sport, or to set us in a debate of Serionfness; there needs no fool in the play here; But this I relate it for, that my Neighbour may see how little he hath said to the business against the only foundation I gave him for my Right in Fithes; and that the world may see, that notwithstanding any strength in his Reasons against my plea, we needed not have troubled our selves to print, nor others in reading what we have printed.

But you have done your wandrings, and now you come the third time to the business: You have played off and on long enough; you will fasten now. What say you now? you have spent four pages in roming about, and now you come to it. You cut us off at the end of the four with six lines, and then easily conclude: I hope you will now desist. Why, the strength of your whole Book should have been bent upon this, to overthrow this Donation. You know it was my only Plea to you, and you confess as much; this you could not yield to, would venture anything rather then pay upon this ground: And are six lines enough for that which hath so great a stroke in the whole Cause? Were I as censoriously addicted as your self, I should from these things infer, that Faction and Emulation, that you may seem stout as well as others, hath carried you on in this Cause against your Conscience: But I doe not so judge you; the Lord help you to judge your self, and to be contented to shame your self for your many miscarriages in this matter, by an humble reforming restoring Repentance, not only of your Brothers goods, but your Brethrens good names, more precious to us then our goods. For my part, I had rather impute this to the craziness of your head, then to the malice of your heart.

But these six lines are full of weight however, and strike the matter dead at a stroke: See what they are fraught with. I know no such thing, and therein you goe beyond my memory and understanding, and I now must take your word for it. Your Landlord will expect you should take his word for his Title to the rest, and I may as well expect you should take my word for my Title to the Tenth. Tenants are not wont to enquire into Titles; if no stop according to Law, they pay their rent where it is pretended to be due. Yet I shall not engage you to take my word; you had time enough given you to search into the truth of my Plea. What if it be beyond your memory? that makes the Title the better in all Law and Reason, if possession be held by vertue of that gift all along; and why cannot you understand this? Is it so hard in other cases, as to the poor, to Hospitals, to Colleges, to Schools? Can you understand how gifts should be perpetually bequeathed to these, and is the like to Ministers, only not to be understood? Can you understand how a man

pages

P. 8.

may By Will passe over his Estate to his children and their posterity for ever: and is it not as easie to be understood how he may give gifts to other persons out of those lands, either for a time, or for ever? what thing more ordinary? How hard is man to understand what he would not should be true? *But that all this word say I am*

F. 10.

But you know no such thing. Before you withheld your payment, you ought to have known the contrary: It seems for what you know you have wronged me; and, as it is, certainly none of yours; so it it may possibly be mine by as good a Right as ever man enjoyed a Legacie for ought you know. This may be then; and if it be, you must resign, your self hath said it: Now what have you done to quiet Conscience in not resigning? have you consulted with those Records which might give light about such ancient things? Have you enquir'd of one able Lawyer, to know the truth of this pretended Right? Shew me one among so many friends and adversaries that will give it under his hand, that the pretended Donation of Tithes in England is a meer forgery, a Constantine's Donation: Oh Neighbour, surely conscience hath been much asleep, if you can withhold a payment due upon the supposition of such a gift, by your own confession, without so much as once examining whether there were such a gift or no. Is it possible that a tender conscience should not tremble to keep goods in his hands, which for ought he knowes, belong to another man; is, or may be sure they belong not to him, and that with so much eagerness of contention? I hope you are not altogether without such motions of fear; I would not have you past feeling.

But it concerns me to prove such a gift who claim by it. By no means, no owner of Land, who hath enjoyed possession by descent for many generations, would think it equal to be forced to shew how they came first into the Family. No Purchaser of Lands troubles himself with such a question; above 60 years uninterrupted possession is enough. How many are able to shew how their Estates come to them from 450. years? Even Mr. Selden, whose grant is counted most sparing, yields us so much for Parochial Tithes, and for Tithes paid at large, much sooner. And must Ministers be put to that which no man else is? are we persons incapable of common Justice, the benefit of that which a Turk having possessions here might enjoy? are we wilde beasts, that may be destroyed any how, *per fas et nefas*? Surely others will count it enough to justify a Title long enjoyed against any thing may be alledged by any man to the contrary: yea, and others will provide they bring their plea within the memory of man; otherwise they expect it should not be admitted at all; no man being supposed to be so long negligent in his own matters, if he be, *currit lex contra negligentem*; and there must be an end of strife. But so shall not I deal with you; do you shew how a Right to the goods

*History of
Tithes, c. 10.
P. 235.*

questioned, hath descended to you by any Lawful means, from any person whatsoever the owner of *Spillhill* farms, either within, or without the memory of man; and if I do not prove mine a better Title, I will give over my right.

Supposed Landlord, altogether unacquainted with the Lawes of the Land, cannot at all prove his Title to his goods or land he holds, must he therefore forfeit them to him that uses the land, who hath no title at all to them? Examining old deeds of gift belongs to another profession, not to yours and mine. How many deeds of gift were never enter'd upon Record? how many Records are worn away by the injury of time, or consumed by several casualties? May we not verily believe that to be true, which is, verily assumed by all knowing men, friends and enemies, and that in a matter of fact, without further enquiry? I know no man that ever denied that such Donations have been, no not those those that professedly write against them.

He thinks in a business that belongs to another calling, it might be a fair Argument to suppose such a thing done, when we see things that are not likely to have come so pass otherwise. Imagine the thing to be done now, if one or two might be gull'd, or forced, might a man be cheated out of so considerable a part of their estates, let it go they know not how? Or if this generation could be so stupid, would the next be in so deep a sleep too? so universal a violence upon that which our Forefathers were as tender of as we, their estates, pass away in silence ages after ages, no man among the many thousand covetous persons, haters of God, his Word, and the Ministry of it to this day opening his mouth to the contrary: especially when we finde such tugging about the manner of enjoying these deeds of gift, as about wood-land, new-broke ground, &c. They that had courage enough to question the manner, would they not much more have questioned the thing, if any just cause had been found? Lest matters then this would satisfie me that the thing was done by consent, as their own act and deed; I know not what will you.

Yet I shall try a little further. Donations are either publick or private; we have both, if both will serve. Of the former you may peruse a Book entitled; *The Civil Right of Tithes*, by G. E. sent down to me by the name of *Elderfield*; among which the very first and most ancient hirs our present Case. A deed of gift related in that famous Law of *Edward the Confessor* about Tithing, made long before under the first Saxon Christian King *Ethelbert*, *Concessa sunt a rege, Civill Rights* *yonibus & populo*, they are granted by King, Barons, and people: this p. 62. you see not by tyrant Kings that thought every foot of land their own; but very orderly, King, his Barons theirs, and peoples theirs, 600. and this in *Kent* too; and that I hope includes *Spillhills* Farm.

What need we now look for private Donations since made? they were indeed more truly restitutions of what was sacrilegiously withheld through the calamity of those hard times under the *Danish* and *Norman*.

The long uncertain fluctuating of Tithes, till they settled in a fixed Parochial Right, demonstrates the first payments, as to any Laws of men were arbitrary.

Now an Invasion: a thing can truly be given but once. We have the Record for above 1000 years; confirmed since, restored, pleaded, used, had, recovered since to this very day: will not this alone constitute a Right? Yet Selden in his History of Tithes, and Tithes Right, demonstrates the first ones out of several Records; and the late Arch-Bishop of Canterbury had many such transcribed for him out of the Records of the Tower of London, as you may see in the Diary of his life, set out by Mr. Pryme: From whence, and other places of Record, more may be fetched, though with some trouble (I suppose) and charge to him that shall be so scrupulously inquisitive into that which so man almost doubts of but my Neighbour.

But admit these many arbitrary private Consecrations (or resecrations rather of what was long before consecrated) yet Staplehurst and Spillhill Farm will not be included in them; as if men were not privileged here to bestow their own goods (if yet they were their own) by free consent, as well as others were by troops in other places. Did others freely elsewhere, and were men here forced? done it was, possession hath been delivered up to the Rectors of Staplehurst, by them enjoyed many generations, none contradicting who will say (though all Records should have perished, or nothing ever Recorded at all) but that the Consecration here was of the same nature as all elsewhere were, free and voluntary: yea, so far were men from being forced to do it, that they were forced to get leave to do it, and to sue that their said free donations might be secured by regal confirmation: such need was there thought to be, that bounds should be set to mens superabundant bounty in those times.

Be not contentious, Neighbour, pray be not; let this satisfy you that such a thing was done; it remains now to examine how well it was done. This more modest adversary in this Cause are contented with: and why not well done? No man can lawfully give away the labours of another that is yet unborn; as if it were lawful for men by Will to make slaves of their posterity for ever. Pray look back to p. 2. Abraham gave it, and Jacob vowed it, the free son of the Parent did binde the children. Yet children are not mentioned in either Abrahams gift, or Jacobs vow. Donors with us have expressed their will to stand for ever; many of them with solemn imprecations against them that should ever alienate what they have so consecrated: yet neither of them were owners of much Land all their life-time, were not owners of a foot of Land at the time of those Dedications; yet they might binde their children to pay Tithes out of what they never gave them. As for our Fathers, if they binde their children to pay Tithes out of the Land they gave them, they make their children slaves: I suppose without labour no Tithes come was;

true, then as well as now. I would you would see how your pleading against our Donation confounds it self.

Well, this was a slip in your memory (that I say, not in your conscience, to write any thing as it fits your present turn) which will you now part with, that Observation, or this Argument? The Observation is one of the main Sinews in your Book, *Abraham and Jacob gave and owned it freely; then God commanded it justly, and gave it to Levi graciously*. The Free gift going before, made the reason of the equity of the command following after; which would have no force but upon this supposal, that their possession was bound by the Free gift of their Ancestors.

P. 14.

What you will do here, I know not; I should advise you to let go rather this Argument, for all your confident conclusion upon it; I hope you will now desist. For pray tell me in seriousness, should your Landlord by a deed of gift pass over to you & your heirs all his right and title to *Spillhill*, and the Land about it free from all incumbrances, even that of Tithes to the Minister, only charging it with a re-charge of Tithes to the poor of *Staplehurst* for ever: would you cry out upon your Landlord as one that meant to make a slave of you? you would think there was you know how much given you by the year for ever, and a good penny worth to him that uses in paying him well for his stock and labour upon it besides. If the Re-charge you are bound to should be 9, or 8, you would count so much less given you as the Re-charge is increased; if he should set the Re-charge higher than the land is worth, so much as when it is paid, there will not remain enough to pay the use for his pains; then I suppose you would intreat your Landlord to keep his gift to himself, and be contented to be his Tenant still. This would not be to make you a Slavey for here would be no violence: if you did not like his gift, you might let it at other you know how to apply. I hope you will desist your using this Argument any more. And here I allude against our Donation whose chief purpose is spoken to. But I shall glean up out of the whole Book what is to be found to invalidate our plea. The next Exception is against the badness of the principles upon which it is supposed to have been done; they indeed amiss in, will weaken the acceptance of such things with God, but not a good while among men. But let what is said. *They fetch all their ground for it out of the Christian Law of God*. And again, *A Acts and Mon-king on his death-bed did give the tenth of all his Land to the Priests' numents, Char- that then were*. But it was a foolish English perdition that they were the ter of England. by the *Law of God* should not be so. It is to be noted that the true sure- Tithing Table- ly you have overtailed too much. Examine we now the particulars of England: were all Popish men? what no Maryns? Look your Book and see: but all within the continuation of a year were so. What Record have you for this? who says so besides your self? some doubtless but they

P. 6.

A Acts and Mon-
king on his death-bed did give
the tenth of all his Land to the
Priests' numents, Char-
that then were

P. 10.

Anatomy of the
Masse.

they who are wont to ask us where our Church was before *Luther*. Our common answer to that Popish taunt is point-blank contradictory to this Assertion of yours, it was where it is now: for all was not Popish then, nor in their form of worship: for did you never hear of the famous *Peter Moulins* Confutation of Poperie out of their own Mass-book? much less were all Papists in that communion. Is it not known, that *Luther* rising up to preach against the Pope, did it *plaudente orbe universo*, the whole world applauding him. Did not the Christian world groan under the burden of Popish tyranny, and cry out for a free General Council, or any effectual means of Reformation? do not all our Writers against *Rome* prove by sensible demonstrations, that Poperie that now is, was but a Faction in the Church, bringing in their innovations, now one, then another, till they were advanced into that body they are now in by the Council of *Trent*? yea, it was possible, that errors creeping in by degrees, and not imposed upon any of necessity, should at once carry away all like a flood before them, no man opening his mouth, nor so much as believing to the contrary: where was the voice of the true Shepherd then? could *Arminianism* rush in so upon us in the Bishops times, or can it now as it is brought in again at the back door by *Sectaries*? yea, do not all know what moderation there was in many of the *Trent* Fathers, and how many of them were sent away in disgrace, all overborn by the violence of the *Romish* party: Is it not Popish, what need the Pope fear so much a General Council as he did? what need that packing & shuffling as was in *Trent*? why forsooth *Italian* Bishops, many of them titular ones, thrust in so much exceeding those from other Nations, that they might over-balance all good motions by their numbers? what need things be so strangely carried there, that their own friends cried shame of it, and the *French* Nation for a long time rejected it as an unlawful Council? and yet this a Conventicle packed for the nonce to carry on the Popish cause, other will grow fearful lest their cake should have proved dough too. Nay when many, I know not but all of our Divines doubt, no such God, hath his company in the midst of Poperie at this day, now that so considerable Bodies of Nations are departed from them and they as evil men & seducers are wont to do, wax worse and worse; and they think & say, it leads them plainly to be of that mind: yet this man makes no bones of concluding concerning the former much better times of *Romish* communion, that all was Popish then, and Nor likely such considerable bodies should have fallen off from them at the case of Reformation, and no doubt of them that shook their hands at the *Romish* abominations, yet shall not depart from that Communion. *Arminius* was not the only man of this sort, I have found many more ready to say any thing rather than to go an errand they have conceived to be so dangerous. I wish you, Neighbour, I am assured you were thus unconsiderately, rashly,

valily, and readily, as you have many things in this Book, besides, as I certainly suppose, and most dishonourable to our common Faith, and Honour, but will be glad of such a confession; and no Protestant, I think, knowing or ignorant, ever yielded it but you. Let it go for shame, and let no more such Erratic Assertions fall from you.

That the Acts and Monuments fetch all their ground for Tithes out of the Mosaical Law, does not appear to me: I finde little disputed for tithes, and two Martyrs, *Walt. Byate* in *Rich.* a time, and *William Thorpe* in *Henr. 8.* time, disputing against it; the former against the necessity of them, the later against the lawfulness: in both little is said in their behalf, only one word from the Arch-Bishop to Thorpe is of any weight, *Then wouldst hereby make the Old Law more free and perfect then the New Law, and this is a New Testament Argument.* I finde also King *Edwards* gift there Recorded, and for it alleged *Jacobus* vow, a place in *Matth.* and a sentence much quoted by the Faculty: *If thou withhold from God the tenth, he will withhold from thee the other nine: or to that purpose.* But the Mosaical Law I finde not urged by any, much less that only. Other things are said, that not at all; yet I may be deceived, something may escape my hasty search, you may perhaps finde that ground else where; yet that ground is not all, if anywhere at all; herein your relation must be blamed. So when it is said a King at his death-bed gave to the Priests that then were, I cannot certainly say no; yet I doubt this is not so, they were wont to give to God and the Church; and that was out of a Popish persuasion that they were due by the Law of God. I want your proof for the fact; you did ill you let it not down.

For the Charter of *England*, it onely confirms the Rights and Liberties that were then known and had, of which Tithes at that time were an undoubted part, but expresses not them, nor any ground of them; much less was the Mosaical Law the ground, and all the ground. What meant you to affirm an untruth, where it is so easie to find you out? The Tithing-table of *England* is a Book I never saw; and you have not seen this seven years, that in it the Mosaical Law should be the only ground is incredible; and if it should prove true, either you have a very good memorie, or write at random, true or false at a venture.

But be this so, they pleaded the Mosaical, and that onely; yet all the Mosaical Law is not Ceremonial; Tithes may be morally due out of the Mosaical Law; and if so, for what you have demonstrated to the contrary, they may have pleaded right. But that we have done with; suppose the ground of the Plea (whatever it was) to be naught; yet it follows not that the obeyers of that Council acted upon those grounds: I have not found any certain evidence of such a thing; and the Lawes about Wood-laud, &c. the prevailing customes in so many places about the manner of Tithing, cutting the Minister short of a precise Tenth, are evidences that the Divine Right of Tithes was not so much regarded by the Donors and Confirmers of them.

Yet again admit Priests so pleaded for them, and people so gave them; will the Donation therefore fall to the ground? frame it then into a general rule. All those deeds of gift which are granted upon a mistaken per-

against
we oppose
with take
minister
2 Ma

swarion; are *ipso facto* void and of no force: Do you not see this a manifest untruth? power to give; and power to receive, will make conveyances valid by the principles moving thereto what they will. So you have dealt in this Argument uncharitably with Authors, uncharitably, falsely, and dishonourably with the Churches of God; and all most apparently to effect nothing by it when you have done.

But Tithes are a Popish thing; and we have covenanted against Popish Innovations: So you speak, and so you write, God give the people hearts to make use of their Covenant. We should have been glad to have seen this prayer answered sooner; yet it will be better then worse, if true now. But then Tithes must pick away among Popish Innovations; if an Innovation, 'tis a pretty ancient one; but how appears it to be a Popish one; a chief Relique of Popery? have you consulted with any about the judgement of Popish writers? I am confident you have not. Never did I find men talk to presumption of the things they knew not, till I met whilom men of your temper. Indeed Neighbour, fictitious engagements make Professors do things: lastly, to the blemishing of that Holy Name that is upon them. Why? the Popish Divines are generally against the Divine Right of Tithes. So Bellarmine, and he affirms that all the Schoolmen are on his side. Hear what River says, *Baronius communis Pontificiorum Theologorum sententia deferit: Baronius* alone for the Divine Right of Tithes among the Popish Divines. So Capellus; *Plerique si non omnes Ecclesie Pontificie Doctores & Theologi*; the most, if not all, the Doctors and Divines of the Popish Church goe against the Divine Right of Tithes; and no wonder, when the Monkish party (their chief Divines) did, and doe suck so great a sweetness from them by drawing them to their dens, which the divine right would have conveyed to other mens doers: Whether Donations were Popish, or no; by this you may plainly see: That alienations were Popish, your self acknowledge; antiquitie doth not clear it from antiquitie, and I fear eternitie will not; they fed upon the stipend per se, but did the work per Vicarium, and flung him the bone after they had picked off the meat. Be it for ever the brand of that Religion that Popery began this: And may this shame once be wiped off from our Reformation; that we have, and do continue in it.

Lastly, Though I finde it not in expresse terms in your writing, yet I suppose it is that you aim at, when you tell us the King on his death-bed gave it to the Priests that then were: And with others it is a principal main exception against the deed of gift, that it was not to such persons as we, but to Popish Priests.

That's not so, *Deo & Ecclesia* do the usual Grants run, to God and the Church. The errors were personal; and die with the person; the next being free from his Predecessors fault, will not be liable to his punishment: Yet a sober adversary will not say that all the Ministers, even in communion with Rome, when Tithes were first given, were Papists; yet if they were, suppose a gift be given to the Church of Staplehurst, and let the present Minister be Arian or Socinian, this mans heresie will not make the next Incumbent

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10.

beir, a sound Orthodox Teacher, uncapable of the gift; for the gift was to the Church, and the error was the man: So is here.

But suppose the giver intended this gift that *Arminian* and *Severian* should be sown among Gospel-truths, as trees among wheat: The tale does not appear to be so here: but admitt, shall the whole grain be void because some one use of it is found unlawful? why then God hath blotted these bad uses out of the deed, the rest remains, and as much need there is the gift should remain, to carry on the still continuing uses as ever, when they were all supposed good: Yea, it may charitably be supposed, that those very devout Donors, if they lived now, would blot out such sinful uses with their own hands, if they should know them displeasing to God; who therefore put them in because they thought them pleasing: If this will not serve mens turn, but the deed, because of some uses impossible to be fulfilled, appearing now unlawful, is to be accounted void as to all the rest, It will then return into the hand of Kings and Princes again (so the present Landlords and Tenants it cannot, whose it never was) and they have contriv'd it by several Acts since the dayes of Reformation, and re-establisht Ministers, as such; what was at first given to *Papish Priests*, as such (if yet it were so.) So if this be a flaw, it is made by those who, if any men on earth, have power to heal it.

And yet I doubt not but as great matters as can be found in these kinds of gift we speak of, will be found as well in most ancient conveyances, especially of publick-charitie; either *Papish* reasons of the Dedication (as remissions *unimpeachable* well elsewhere as here) or *Papish* uses of the thing dedicated: Yea, in most old wills of any that died any thing wealthy, we shall finde something that savour'd of the ignorant devotion of those superstitious times. And why should this be an Exception against our Tenure only, which is against no mans else, would be enquir'd into; unless this be it, that Ministers of all men are the only fit persons to be made a prey of, who have more reason to defend themselves against this plea, than any sort of persons whatsoever under the same condition, in that those gifts designed in part to such unlawful uses, were given to God and his Church, not to the person of any man: Now, though what is given to God for unlawful uses, may, and must be taken from those uses, and applied to others; yet from God and his Church they cannot; no man can so firmly call that his own which is given him, as God does that which is given to him: and to God die things that are Gods, never to be alienated more.

Num. 10

The Conclusion.

Your Book I have done with: If any strength of reason hath escaped my careful search, I am sorry for it; I hope none hath. If in any thing I have mistaken your mind, I shall be willing to be reas'd: whether my Reply be insufficient, or full, judge you, but do it as an humble meek-spirited Christian should do: Let not any factious engagement to beat up a party, nor vain-glorious desire to preserve the credit of Your Book, you have appear'd to the world in; nor yet any scornful resolutions of pride,

disclaiming instruction from a man so much younger then your selfe; Let
 not this, nor any thing else pervert a right judgment in you. Recantations
 are hard things, even to godly people; yet a greater man then either you
 or I, is more famous for Books of that nature, then for almost any other
 that he hath written; yet many of his writings against the *Pelagians* are
 choise pieces too. Therefore pray remember, that all error about Gods
 Truths is sinful, the knowledge of the truth being as well commanded us,
 as obedience to it; and those errors are most especially sinful, which are
 about matters of practice; for they necessarily defile the whole man, and
 annoy others; And of these, if any more then others, they that cur asun-
 der those linkes of society which unite men into bodies together; such
 as make us prei upon one anothers goods, unfaithfully break serious and
 frequent promises, and then say all manner of evil falsly of those we have
 thus injur'd; disdaine them if they be younger then our selves; requite great
 tenderness with highest contumely, and mock that patience that would
 faine live at peace with us, put what we please into their mouths to make
 them ridiculous; proclaime words well meant, necessarily spoken, if bur-
 liable to any misconstruction, concealing what would clear the suspicion,
 to make them odious; resolve after all to have nothing to doe with
 them, and stir up the Saints to doe the like. All this hath your er-
 rour been fruitful in unto very unkind practices against me: I lay now a-
 nother such principle of error, to produce such practices towards others,
 and you will not be fit to be either Elder or member of a Church, nor yet
 to live in a society of men. If now you should adde obstinacie to all this,
 how sad will your account be? I pray doe not; and what any thing I
 could do might mollifie you, the Judge is at the door. Shall I be forced to
 write that to you which we are wont to speak to common profane persons
 to bring them to repentance? Nay, *let the love of Christ constrain you*: you
 are an aged disciple, however of late years sadly misled, and misleading o-
 thers. Why should the many palpable sins in this matter, which none can
 open his mouth for, and your best friends are asham'd of, stand upon Re-
 cord to the ruine of soules? the Blasphemies, Heresies, Ambition, Coe-
 rousness, Covenant-breaking, Inconstancie, Unpeaceableness, Hellish rail-
 ings, and most bitter, yet false accusations, one against another, which the
 Professors of this age are notoriously guilty of, have hardened multitudes of
 profane ones, and sent them by troops into hell. Have compassion on your
 own soules; have compassion on the soules of many others, whose ruine such
 language and such dealings doe most visibly endanger: The Lord deliver
 profane ones from imitating you in that which you stir up Saints to imitate
 you in. As for me, your unfaithful dealing with me cannot ruine my estate,
 nor your reproaches wound my reputation among them that know my life,
 to be neither covetous nor revengful: And, as I am most assured I am set
 here of God for the good of this people, so I am most resolv'd to continue
 in the Lords work to the end; for which I beg his assistance, and in which
 I wait for his powerful presence unto much success in my undertakings for
 the soules of those under my care; and I am most confident in the help of
 God, that your and all mens oppositions, whoever they be, will be as fru-
 strate.

fruits as theirs are wont to be, who fight against God; and in this hope and strength of assurance I rest.

In the mean time as to what concerns you, I would heartily advise you to examine once again before you die, with all serious humble self-denying industry, those principles which have led you to so high an opposition against your Brethren, in these last years of your life. Lay aside your endeavours to support the *Arminian* cause; all your skill cannot add to what others have said for it before you: your attempts that way will but render you laugh at by some, and pitted for your arrogance by others. Look *Rom. 16. 17* home as you draw to your long home; set before your eyes the many *1 Cor. 1. 1* plain Scriptures against division, and then compare them Faithfully with &c. *3. 13.* those Scriptures you suppose call you to it: the exceptions from the general Rule of Unity had need be as plain as the Rule it self is; you know *2 Cor. 13.* what miseries have followed, not onely to others good and bad; the good *Eph. 4. 2, 3* discouraged, and the bad hardened, but even to your selves for one added to your assemblies how many broken off, some of which prime leading men; you that have broken others, how hath God broken you? What vexation it hath created you to keep your own in Unity; what heart-breaking it is to see such Devilish Doctrines, and practises broke out of the camp of your Friend, your own heart knows best; the little succeſſe your way had in its first enterance into the world, to disturbe and disgrace the Reformation in *Germany*, what fearful sins it broke out into, and what a shameful end it had, you have heard of. Now in these last dayes it hath removed it tents into *England*, and for a time bore a great sway; such men almost the onely employed men in places of service and gain in Army, Navy, everywhere: it now is in its declining (pardon the confidence of the word) the fearful sins we see dayly, and I doubt not but we shall see the shameful end too, though I hope not with that severity of the State upon you, God restraining you from such outrageous attempts against the civil peace. Me thinks this should be looked upon as a seasonable admonition from God, to consider your wayes; that you may be sure this sad unprosperous path is yet of Gods chalking out to you. Show me one instance of a truth of Gods, that hath had the like succeſſe, once and again: it was not so with the Reformation of Religion at that time attempted in *Germany*; it is not so with our Reformation here, though checked by manifold hinderances, yet it goes on, and want's onely a time of healing among dissenting Brethren, to Crown and compleat it; and I am most assured they, whose pride and faction hinders this (where principles are not hard to be reconciled) shall bear their blame, and that evidently before men, who ever they be; it never fell our wish any truth thus as 'tis with your cause, never since the world stood. Consider your wayes; you had need have a command as clear as any is in all Scripture, to secure you in such unprosperous paths, from the fear of Gods fighting against you.

If yet having done this work of trying your wayes with all serious conscientious care, you find cause to settle in your received persuasion and practise: let me then advise again, and request of you to believe of us, that we are men that desire in all things to keep a good conscience, both towards

God and towards men; that we do not willfully shut our eyes against any known truth, nor resist any known duty: we speak our very hearts after much diligent search, and do not dissemble; we tell you that it nowhere appears to us, where God hath cast our Believers Infants, from that special covenant they were once received into, and from that Church membership that flows from thence; yea, when we suppose the evidences for the contrary are full, and not onely not yet soundly answered by any, but not answerable, we in this speak our very mind: And we desire you to believe us, when we profess our selves amazed to see what miserable hints you are put to to establish the Foundations of the contrary: these grieves us to see some of you for this end, to revive *Pelagianisme*, by denying original sin (yet *Pelagius* durst not deny Infant baptism for all that, though often put to it. *Aug.* tells us what would have become of him, if he had, he would have been in danger of mens spile and Womens Scandals if he had; *Christi virorum*, sithas ears could not endure such a thing to see your self and many others of you to hold original sin universally remitted to all mankind by a general *Cosita Sanda* covenant; straug this to us, that there should be a Covenant remitting finnes, which hath no condition on mans side; and that all the damned should have one sin remitted to them, when they have done else; the very best of our special Covenant, who with us and you hold original sin, and wish us against you deny its universal Remission, when they know not what to say concerning the hope of any Infants Salvation, but leave them to God, that is in effect contentedly give them all up to Hell. That distinction of Spiritual promises to the Spiritual seed, only Fleishly promises to the Fleishly seed, is verily to us an amazement; it overturns the Foundations of Divinity; we verily believe that the same thing that gives us a Covenant Title to the Kingdom of Heaven, gives us a Covenant Title to a piece of bread; that Spiritual and temporal blessings dispensed by way of promise to a particular person flow from one and the same Covenant; that its Godliness hath the promise of this life as well as of that which is to come; that God puts them both together in the Covenant with *Abraham* and his Seed; that I will be their God is exceedingly more then I will give them the Land of *Canaan*; that God did not mocke the Servant among the *Jews* and the *Proselytes*, when he gave circumcision as a sign between them and him, when he intended that on his part it should signify nothing: that God would never make man a debter to him in the sign of the mutual Covenant, who by the same Covenant and sign of would make himself a debter of nothing to man: that unbelief would never have kept the *Jews*, whose carcases fell in the wilder nesse, from entering into the Land of *Canaan*, and Idolatry with other sins would never have cast them out again, if *Canaan* had belonged unto them, meerly as the Fleishly Seed of *Abraham*: if the same Faith which was the condition of the Heavenly *Canaan*, were not also the condition of the Earthly: that *Abraham* is in vain made a pattern of justification to all Nations, if what was done in him was singular, and rested in his person; if circumcision were a seal of the Righteousnesse of Faith to him, and to him onely; we conceive the Apostle excludes such phancies in his own expresse

his dicere
Baptizem-
ne non so-
facies ve-
spus infici-
um virorum,
ita Sanda-
muliercula-
commissi-
tur. *Aug.*
tra Julia-
n. l. 3. 5.
n enim illi
tri lava-
m regenera-
nis & remis-
sio peccato-
n audent ne-
re, ne hoc
ristiana au-
ferre non
sint. 2. de
cat. origin.
Tim. 4. 8.
n. 17. 7, 8, 10.
al. 5. 3.

br. 3. 19.

om. 4. 11.

express words; he received that he might be a Father; and what is this
 that he might be a Father? he explains himself that spiritualness might
 be imputed to them also: I would hazard any ill consequence might be
 soundly drawn from the Doctrine of Infant Baptisme, then venture any one
 of these things; they are verily in our eyes monstrous imaginations of dream-
 ing men al of them; so it seems a certain truth, that spiritual promises to
 the fleshy Seed of Abraham were a part and the chiefest of Abraham's bles- Gal. 3. 14.
 sing; & that this is done on the Gentils through Jesus Christ; & that if the root Rom. 11. 16.
 be holy, so are the branches, is a truth universally verified of Jew & Gentile;
 & where God puts our Childrens names into the sealed indenture of Cove-
 nant between us & him, we dare not be so blasphemous to God, & unnatural
 to our Children, as to blot out their names again; these are our very thoughts:
 we shut our eyes against no light, but have weighed what is alleged on the
 behalf of your cause in the balance of our most impartial judgement, accord-
 ing to Scripture, and find it light: and our Request to you is, if you must
 suppose us to erre in judgement (the Lord reveal even this unto you) that
 yet where our conversation is orderly according to the Gospel, you would
 spare our hearts, which are to be judged by a Severe one that knows them
 better and their secrets, then you do. That you would remember what be- Rom. 2. 15.
 nefit your self once received in your most zealous following of such as we
 are, and would conclude if possible, that others may have the same benefit
 in their conscientious attendance upon us now; and to out of gratitude,
 charity, and wisdom to stand out of the way of their curse, which is woe
 to be the portion of them that heare at that burdensome stone; who hin-
 der the Preaching of the word to ignorant carnal ones, that they may be sa-
 ved; the objects of so much pity and compassion; and if it be their stub-
 bornesse that they will not follow your assemblies, yet let them be
 brought to Christ anywhere; and do you rejoyce with us at such power-
 ful experiences of mercy, and do not envy us: why should you seek to de-
 stroy us by Petitions, Remonstrances, Practices? Do not do so, it will not
 turn to your account; if you must divide, carry it no further then needs
 must, if you cannot have to do with us, as much as it were comfortable
 that you did; and we take it to be your duty; yet resolve not to have no-
 thing to do with us: nothing is a hard word, and Actions suitable to such
 words are harder; no dealing was high arrogance in the Jews even against
 Samaritans; Christ sets us there a more merciful Example; there is love,
 pity, Prayer, doing good, speaking well, furthering one another in what
 we agree, debating what we differ in with ingenuous opennesse, humillity, These are becom-
 and meekenesse; if we must speak amisse of wayes, be we tender how we then nothing
 speak amisse of persons: a great sumptome of an high inward Fever is a do.
 black fowl rough tongue. David and Paul both fetch the Character of the Rom. 3. 13, 1
 man who hath no fear of God before his eyes, in a great part from the vi-
 ciousnesse of the tongue; the Spear broke Christs side, but reproach broke
 his heart; among the grieving sins to the holy Spirit of God we find bitter- Eph. 4. 30, 31
 nesse and evil speaking; railing accusations are uncomely for Angels; fit Jude 9. 13, 1
 onely for raging waves of the Sea, that foame out their own shame, to whom
 is reserved the blacknesse of darknesse for ever. Remember Neighbour, that
 a day

Zech. 12. 10.
 1 Thes. 2. 16.

P. 6.

Jo. 4. 9.

Pf. 64. 20.

Eph. 4. 30, 31
Jude 9. 13, 1

with a

a day of Execution of Judgment is a coming for God to conviction of hard Speeches as of hard hearts, who will not be convinced of them sooner; but of you my Neighbour I shall yet hope better things, and shall be glad to see them by the humble acknowledgements of the many such your Book is filled with.

Luc. 19. 41. &c.
Jude 18. 19.

As for mocking in matters that concern Salvation, and between persons whose age and quality of life should make more serious in common things; for you and I to get up into the seat of the Scorners. I cannot think of it without terror how lamentable it is; Oh do not so any more; remember Christ weeping and sobbing over Jerusalem almost every word he spoke; do not in all things fulfil the Prophecy; Oh that it were fulfilled upon you in nothing! Do you remember what sin cost Christ for the Elect? and what sin must cost the Reprobates in Hell? and can you make a mock of sin? any sin? Plead not Eliak's Example to Basil Priests; we are not the men, neither have you the Spirit; you will not, I hope, do that which follows in the History: *The Lord soften my hard heart more and more, give me Jeremies Fountain of waters, that I may weep day and night for my sin, for yours, and for other mens sins.* This sure is the true Ministers temper; *With a mocking Spirit we shall Preach proudly, but with a weeping Spirit we shall Preach compassionately;* and you may judge which is like to be the more successful. *And* that laboured so abundantly, and whole Labours were crowned so plentifully, was one that ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears.

AE. 20. 31.

Rom. 14. 15.

Cor. 13.

Phil. 3. 16.

35.

It was thought by the Apostle a piercing word, *now walkest thou not charitably*; more almost could not have been spoken to the shame of a Christian; let us mend the Characters of charity, and write them out in the hearts; and if our debates be not then ended, they will be wounded; wherein our attainments are one, let us walk by the same Rule, mind the same things; and this will be a means by Prayer, and the conscientious Study of Scripture with humble conferences, according to Scripture, to have God reveal to us wherein we agree not. Alienation of affections makes controversies endlesse more then the Intricacy of them; where Judgment Reurs a little Christs seamelesse Coar, Passion and self Interest pursue the breach, and tear it from top to bottom: yea, most common it is that whar Passion begins, reason must defend and make good; let us therefore walk together so far as we may, till we must needs part, then with Friendly seriousness debate the rest; and let a Scripture Spirit sway in our resolutions, not the Spirit of man which is proud and willful, and then I am perswaded our much desired Peace may returne to us.

To this aime I direct these Papers of mine, humbly beseeching God, the Giver of that Wisdom which is pure and Peaceable, to prosper them, to accomplish what they are directed to; to instruct the ignorant, convince the gainsayers, confirm the sound-minded; to mollify sharp and eager Adversaries, not exasperate them; and then it will not grieve me, nor offend others that so unworthy a name as mine is hath been in Print.

F I N I S.

READER.

There should have been inserted p. 26. lin. 25. these few things following; which though they were omitted in that place by the Printers oversight: I desire thou wouldest take notice of them here; they are as followeth.

This gives a fair reason against the morality of a tenth of the tenth, if it was paid to the High Priest, for himself alone, & the other Priests shared with the Levite in the rest: but in case the tenth of tenth was paid to the High Priest for himself, & his fellow Priests; so make them sharers with him, not with the Levites; as is thought by some out of Neh. 10. 28. Then somewhat more is to be said, why the tenth of tenth belongs not to our present inquiry, as being confessedly Ceremonial, whereas the Levites tenth was not. The reasons of this I humbly conceive, are from the great difference in the Officers under the Law, from the Officers under the Gospel, in point of;

1. Number. Then the Priests, the Sons of Aaron were a small part of their Brethren the children of Levi; and therefore were well provided for by a tenth out of the tenth: Whereas it is otherwise under the Gospel comparing Bishops and Deacons together; they began with twelve on one side (though we exclude the seventy) and seven on the other side; and in all ages so it continued, Deacons fewer then the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments; a tenth therefore of a tenth cannot be observed now.

2. Service. The difference between the Priests service and the Levites being wholly Ceremonial; consequently the difference of maintenance, which in part was grounded on a different service (the Priests not being a tenth part of the Levites, though they had a tenth part of their provision) must be Ceremonial too; if the Priest prayed for, and blessed the people so did the Levite. Neh. 9. 4. 5. If the Priest taught the people out of the Law, so did the Levite. 2 Chro. 17. 8, 9. If the Priest executed Judgement in matters of the Lord, so did the Levite. 2 Chro. 19. 8, 11. Take away Sacrifices and what was annexed to them, and their service are altogether the same: but so it is not between Bishop and Deacon under the Gospel. *Quid in eo?* The summe is, the Command of a tenth from the people might be moral, yet the distribution of it & between Priests and Levites in part civil, referring to their different numbers; in part Ceremonial, referring to their different services; so the Reverend Master Tho. Hookers conclusion; upon the supposed morality of a tenth will not follow (Ergo the Ministers must have the tenth of a Tenth.)

This foundation removed out of the way; the enforcement of this reason added by that excellent holy man falls to the ground with it. It is this (then Ministers must receive from them happily, who were never taught by them; as the Levites who taught in the particular Synagogues paid to the Priest, and to the Levites too; who administered in Jerusalem) this is supposed contrary to Gal. 6. 6. but indeed is not; for cases may be where in they that are not taught are bound to contribute to a Teacher as well as they that are: Master Hooker might have observed one case at home in the Preachers to the convert Indians; we are all, both Englands, New and Old, their Debtours of an honorable maintenance, though they never Teach us. They that do common service for all (as the Priests at Jerusalem did for the Levites as well as for the rest of the Jews) deserve a common provision from all. But however to put all out of doubt, as there is no such distribution of Offices for the people, as a part of the peoples service to be performed by some Officers, where the people live; and a part by other Officers elsewhere; so there is not that distribution of payments: but he that is taught communicates to him that Teaches, and ordinarily to none else, none else being constantly attending to serve him else where.

Survey of
discip. p.
2 p. 31.

Tenth of tithes therefore on all hands are laid aside. That I may not reply
 to what is offered by that most reverend man of God, against the morality of a tenth
 1.2.p.37. (this first Plea indeed he opposes; but the second he is a fast Friend. And take a
 2.4 p.16. brief answer to his first reason also as what is above is in his second; it runs thus;
 2. this (the Gospel way) is raised out of all good things the person that it taught
 hath; but those Tithes in the old Testament were out of the seed of the Land, fruit
 of the Trees, or of the herd of the Flock. Lev.27.30,31,32. Deut.14.22,23.) The
 place in Deut. speaks of Tithes for Feasts and Sacrifices; but let that passe in
 the Argument; this may be considered of, That setting that question aside, whether
 personal Tithes were not due under the Law as well as predial; Doctor Burget
 hath offered something for it, and neither of these Scriptures say any thing against
 Gen.28. it. This I say, which is clear, that Jacobs vow was of all; and Abrahams pay-
 ment was of all and of spoiles (personal Tithes) by name; if the Apostles deserv-
 12. & 14. ing be duly rendered) under the Law Tithes are a right current; the measure
 15. of them is not therefore to be taken thence, but from the evidences that are before, if
 Hebr. 7.4. Moses Law do not mention personal Tithes; tis enough if they do not renounce them;
 before their due use otherwise is stated already, if Abraham and Jacob did what they
 did by Law, of which before. Here then is a wonderful agreement between
 Law and Gospel, of all says Abraham and Jacob, in all good things says Paul.
 This with all tender respect to the never dying memory of that blessed man, con-
 cerning what in this debate his reasons seem to be defective in.

E R R A T A.

P.2. lin. 24. say also inquire, read also will inquire, in Maye. 19. r. 14. l.26. put
 with, r. put off with. p.3. l.3. offer, r. offered. p.8. l.3. yet see what he prints. p.10.
 l.10. shame, r. slander. p.13. in m. Act.4.5. r. Am.4.4.5. Act.19. r. Act.29. p.15. l.

37. streng. r. strengthen. p.17. Liansepmulr, by, r. then. p.18. { Law { Divine,
 r. { Law { Divine. { Humane,
 r. { Free-gift { Humane. p.20. in m. Gen.32. r. 32. p.21. l.12. dele and dele. p.
 23. l.4. to be verified a mystery, r. to be verified in a mystery. l.31. shut, r. ser. p.
 24. l.16. with, r. with. p.26. in m. Num.18. l.8. r. 28. & Deut.14.23,26. p.27. in m.
 16. l.2. r. 26. l.30. how, r. now. p.30. l.12. bring, r. being. p.31. l.27. things, read
 times. p.34. l.33. I think justly, r. I fear so too. p.35. in m. Act.14.16. r. 17. p.38. in
 m. Priest. Gatech. r. practice. Gatech. l.4. a Brasse Parthing, r. a broken Brasse Par-
 thing. p.41. in m. p.41. r. l.2. Law, r. Law. p.42. l.32. if, r. is. p.46. l.18. conver-
 ted, r. required. p.48. l.31. there, r. these. p.49. l.19. by, r. abide. p.51. l.34. watches,
 r. coaches. p.54. l.2. charge, r. change. p.59. l. ult. now, r. no. p.56. in m. Luc.10. l.10.
 r. 17. p.60. l.5. a fine for his Sons, r. the Priests a fine; for Tithing, r. threat-
 ning. p.62. l.27. this, r. thy. p.64. l.26. If. 49.13. r. 23. p.65. l.12. but, r. you. l.31. af-
 ter rule adde best. p.66. l.16. against, of in m. Mark. r. Matth. p.67. in m. Matth.
 27. r. 26. p.69. l.12. after prayed against by the Church, 1 Tim.2.2. adde this,
 that we find; we find also, an appeal to them in a case purely of Religion,
 Act.25.18.19. and this supposes a power in these cases; yet Paul himself pro-
 tests it, v.10. when I ought. l.34. of, r. with. p.70. l.1. why should this. Where
 say, r. why this. Where should say. l. penult. came, r. come. p.71. l.5. a fine for thus,
 r. this. p.79. l.18. they & their, r. he & his. p.81. l.35. mended, r. minded. p.84. l.10.
 dele therefore. p.85. l.35. after letting adde out. p.86. l.27. in l.30. after was,
 adde not. p.94. l.15. it was possible, r. was it possible. p.97. l.37. this, r. they. p.
 100. l.14. scandals, r. sandals. l.38. after sign of, adde it. p.101. in m. Pl.60. ac. r. 69.
 20. p.102. lin.1. after men adde as well in. v.26. mend the, r. mind his. in the
 hearts, read in our hearts.

